

The University of Chicago

INTERMEDIARY SCHOOL OFFICERS
IN LARGE CITIES

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AUGUST, 1947

By
THADDEUS JOHN LUBERA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1947

The University of Chicago

INTERMEDIARY SCHOOL OFFICERS
IN LARGE CITIES

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AUGUST, 1947

By
THADDEUS JOHN LUBERA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1947



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Investigation	
The Nature of the Problem	
Sources of Data	
Preliminary Organization of Data	
Organization of the Investigation	
II. RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS IN CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS	6
Emergence of City Superintendents and Intermediary Officers	
Intermediary Officers in Fifty-Seven Large City School Systems	
Summary	
III. POWERS AND DUTIES ASSIGNED TO THE INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS IN CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS	67
Sources of Materials	
Duties of Early Intermediary Officers	
Supervision Emphasized as Duty of Early Intermediary Officers	
Changes in Functions of Intermediary Officers	
Analysis of the Duties Assigned to Intermediary Officers in Fifty-Seven Cities	
Intermediary Officer as a Business Manager	
Methods of Selecting Intermediary Officers	
Professional Preparation of Intermediary Officers	
Compensation of Intermediary Officers in Fifty-Seven Cities	
Summary	
IV. POWERS AND DUTIES OF INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS RECOMMENDED IN SCHOOL SURVEY	112
Introduction	
Deputy, Chief Deputy, First Assistant and Chief Associate Superintendent	
Associate, Assistant, and Associate-Assistant Superintendent	
District Superintendents	
Supervising Principals	
Findings and Recommendations of Surveys and Studies	
Summary	

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
Chapter	
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	164
BIBLIOGRAPHY	175

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Cities with Population of 100,000 or Over Considered in This Study	2
2. Number of Cities in the United States with Population of 100,000 and Over at Each Federal Census Date . . .	7
3. Titles of Intermediary Officers in Fifty-Seven Cities of 100,000 Population and Over, Number of Cities Using the Titles and Number of Intermediary Officers Employed in 1945	62
4. Number of Intermediary Officers in Cities Grouped According to Population	63
5. Decades in Which Positions of Intermediary were Established and Number of Officers Employed in 1945 in Fifty-Seven Cities	64
6. Administrative and Supervisory Duties of Intermediary Officers in Fifty-Seven Cities	102
7. Duties of District Superintendents and Supervising Principals in Six Cities	103
8. Duties of Deputy, Chief Deputy, First Assistant and Chief Associate Superintendents in Ten Cities . .	104
9. Methods of Choosing Intermediary Officers and Their Tenure Status	105
10. Degrees Held by Intermediary Officers in Fifty-Seven Cities	107
11. Salaries Paid to the Intermediary Officers in Fifty-Seven Cities in the Year 1944-1945	108
12. Duties Assigned to Associate Superintendents in New York City, 1942-1943	138
13. Duties Performed by Intermediary Officers in Relation to the Improvement of Instruction in Fifty-Seven Cities	155
14. Obstacles Which Prevent the Intermediary Officers from Devoting Efforts to Improvement of Instruction in the Fifty-Seven Cities	157

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Investigation

Two types of administrators in city school systems, namely superintendents and principals, have been carefully studied by students of educational administration. A third type, the intermediary administrator, who functions between the superintendent and the principal carrying important responsibilities in most school systems in cities of 100,000 population and over is the subject of this study. This administrator is designated by different titles, such as associate, deputy, and assistant superintendent, supervising principal, and district superintendent. The rise and development of this administrative position, its duties and responsibilities, its present status in city school systems, and the possibilities of the position for unique professional services have not been the subject of administrative research.

The Nature of the Problem

Since most of the important duties and powers of these administrative officers have evolved over a period of considerable time, it is the purpose of this study:

To trace their development in city school systems in order to ascertain when and under what conditions the positions were established, the nature of the duties, and the responsibilities assigned to such officials at the time of their appointment.

To study the functions assigned to intermediary officers in the fifty-seven school systems in the United States with populations of 100,000 or over from which data were obtainable.

To ascertain the changes which have taken place in the functions of these intermediary officers since the establishment of their positions.

To examine and critically evaluate the powers and duties recommended for intermediary officers in surveys of city school

systems.

Sources of Data

The study is restricted to intermediary school administrators in fifty-seven American cities with populations of 100,000 and over. It was in these large urban centers that schools first grew to considerable size and experienced the greatest need for intermediary assistants.

These school systems have been prominent from 1900 to the present time. Their reports constitute an important source of data for this investigation.

The ninety-two cities having a population of 100,000 and over were selected for study in the investigation. However, only fifty-seven of the ninety-two cities provided data pertinent to the problem under consideration.

The fifty-seven cities and their population in 1940 are given in Table 1.

TABLE 1
CITIES WITH POPULATION OF 100,000 OR OVER
CONSIDERED IN THIS STUDY
(1940 CENSUS)

Cities	Population	Cities	Population
Atlanta, Ga.	302,288	Erie, Pa.	116,922
Baltimore, Md.	859,100	Flint, Mich.	151,543
Boston, Mass.	770,816	Fort Worth, Texas	177,662
Buffalo, N. Y.	575,901	Gary, Ind.	111,719
Charlotte, N. C.	100,899	Grand Rapids, Mich.	164,292
Chattanooga, Tenn.	128,163	Houston, Texas	384,514
Chicago, Ill.	3,396,808	Indianapolis, Ind.	386,972
Cincinnati, Ohio	455,610	Jacksonville, Fla.	173,065
Cleveland, Ohio	878,336	Kansas City, Mo.	399,178
Columbus, Ohio	306,087	Long Beach, Calif.	164,271
Dayton, Ohio	210,718	Los Angeles, Calif.	1,504,377
Denver, Colo.	322,412	Louisville, Ky.	319,377
Des Moines, Iowa	159,819	Milwaukee, Wis.	587,472
Detroit, Mich.	1,623,432	Minneapolis, Minn.	492,370
Duluth, Minn.	101,065	Newark, N. J.	429,760

TABLE 1--Continued

Cities	Population	Cities	Population
New Bedford, Conn.	110,348	San Antonio, Texas	253,854
New Haven, Conn.	160,605	San Diego, Calif.	203,341
New York City, N. Y.	7,454,995	San Francisco, Calif.	634,536
Norfolk, Va.	144,332	Seattle, Wash.	368,302
Oakland, Calif.	302,163	Somerville, Mass.	102,177
Peoria, Ill.	105,087	Springfield, Mass.	149,554
Philadelphia, Pa.	1,931,334	Tacoma, Wash.	109,408
Pittsburgh, Pa.	671,659	Toledo, Ohio	282,349
Providence, R. I.	253,504	Utica, N. Y.	100,518
Richmond, Va.	193,042	Washington, D. C.	663,091
Rochester, N. Y.	324,975	Wichita, Kansas	114,996
Sacramento, Calif.	105,958	Wilmington, Del.	112,504
St. Louis, Mo.	816,048	Youngstown, Ohio	167,720
St. Paul, Minn.	287,736		

The annual reports of the boards of education proved to be the best source of data regarding the origin and development of intermediary officers. These reports, especially from 1851 to 1900, were valuable in revealing pertinent information regarding the need for intermediary officers. These reports were also valuable for detailed accounts of the activities of intermediary officers and of the points of view of the superintendents of schools and boards of education at the time the positions were established. A list of the reports used in the study is given in the appendix. Altogether 277 different reports were read. In addition thirty-two special annual reports by superintendents of large cities were read and analyzed.

The development of the problem with which this study is concerned has required an extensive use of handbooks, and rules and regulations of Boards of Education. This is especially evident in Chapter III which deals with the existing duties of intermediary officers. A list of these handbooks together with dates of publication in each of the cities considered is included in the appendix.

The procedure followed in the development of Chapter IV was somewhat different from that of Chapters II and III. The

difference lies in the use of other sources. In the latter two chapters, considerable use of handbooks, rules and regulations, and proceedings of board meetings was made. Analysis of Survey Reports revealed pertinent information with respect to duties and trends regarding intermediary officers. The surveys utilized in the investigation are also listed in the bibliography.

In order better to ascertain the functions of intermediary officers in the cities of 100,000 or over a letter and a check list inquiry were sent to each of the ninety-two superintendents of schools in these cities. Sixty-eight replies were received; fifty-seven were acceptable for use in this study.

In each case, all data in the check lists were carefully read and compared with official proceedings and annual reports of the boards of education and those of the superintendents of schools.

Special reports of intermediary officers to their superintendents together with research investigations by Gilland,¹ Pierce,² and Reavis³ revealed many administrative practices pertaining to the duties and responsibilities of intermediary officers.

Preliminary Organization of Data

The first step in the collection of the data for the investigation was to search out in the annual reports and board proceedings all the pertinent passages referring to intermediary school officers. These passages were designated for note taking. Upon completion of all materials in note form including answers to questions in the check list inquiry, classification of the data was begun. In preliminary sorting, special attention was

¹Thomas McD. Gilland, The Origin and Development of the Power and Duties of the City School Superintendent. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

²Paul R. Pierce, The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

³William C. Reavis and Others, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities: Bulletin of the Department of Secondary School Principals, Vol. XXI, No. 66. Washington: Department of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association, 1937.

given to the broad phases of development treated under chapter headings. This sorting aided in determining the scope of the related chapters; for example, data relating to "inservice training of principals" by the district superintendent were grouped under "duties of intermediary officers."

Grouping all data into subdivisions under each chapter heading was next undertaken. In some instances this involved frequent regrouping. Careful study of the content of the sub-topics made it possible to determine approximate subtitles and to construct a tentative outline of each chapter.

Organization of the Investigation

Chapter II deals with the historical development, origin, and early efforts of superintendents to secure appointments of intermediary officers. The controversy which existed between the school boards and some of the superintendents of schools with respect to the appointment, qualifications, and final choice of intermediary officers revealed the different existing attitudes and criteria used in the selection of personnel.

Careful study of the early "inservice duties" of the intermediary officers and the expansion of their purely administrative activities are discussed in Chapter III.

The evaluation of the effectiveness of intermediary officers is exceedingly pertinent to this study. Recommendations made by authorities in school administration in outstanding school surveys of urban school systems were utilized in evaluating the importance of the existing duties assigned to intermediary school officers.

CHAPTER II

RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS IN CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Emergence of City Superintendents and Intermediary Officers

The city superintendent of schools did not emerge until the last decade of the first half of the nineteenth century. The state superintendent and the county superintendent both preceded the city superintendent on the educational scene in the United States. Only a few city superintendencies had been established before 1850. The development of the city superintendency was delayed considerably by the civil war, although the need for a superintendent of city schools was greatly accentuated by the civil war. By 1870, probably not more than twenty-five cities in the United States had taken steps to provide for such a school officer.

The principal of the local school was the time honored administrator in urban communities. However, as the cities grew in size it became apparent that boards of education could neither provide the leadership needed for rapidly developing school systems nor could they secure the desired leadership from the school principal. After numerous experiments in administration in city systems the superintendent as a professional assistant and consultant of the city board of education emerged. His development was closely related to the growth of large cities in the latter half of the nineteenth century and first quarter of the twentieth century.

The problem of establishing and developing schools was greatest in the rapidly growing urban communities. Here it was that the boards of education first discovered their need for a professional executive. After the emergence of the superintendent it was in the very large city that the need for the intermediary functionary became acute. The reason the intermediary officer di

not appear in city school administration until after 1850 as shown later in this chapter was the fact that there were no very large cities in the United States until after that date. The following table discloses the number of cities of 100,000 population and over reported on each federal census date after the middle of the nineteenth century.

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES
WITH POPULATION OF 100,000 AND OVER
AT EACH FEDERAL CENSUS DATE

Year	Number of Cities
1850	0
1860	8
1870	13
1880	19
1890	26
1900	31
1910	44
1920	53
1930	56
1940	92

When school systems were moderate in size the superintendent was able to visit classrooms frequently and to deal intimately with the problems which came within his jurisdiction. This was not possible when school systems became large, employing many teachers and serving many pupils. The large cities often included many square miles of territory. There were many buildings to inspect and maintain, numerous classrooms to visit, textbooks to select, pupils to transfer and promote, and curricular materials to grade. All these and numerous other duties became so arduous for the superintendent that he found himself unable to perform them, at least to his own satisfaction.

When the superintendent came into the picture in city school administration, he found principals in charge of local schools. These principals were generally little more than head teachers. Outside of being responsible for the instruction of a

class of pupils, the principals had few managerial and administrative duties other than the maintenance of order among pupils in the corridors and on the grounds during intermissions. Furthermore, the principals were untrained for supervision and administration. In fact, one of the large responsibilities of the superintendent was the improvement of the principals as his professional representatives in the local schools.

In the course of time as the school systems increased in size and the superintendent found it impossible to visit the local schools frequently, he sought to have the principals released from teaching duties in order that they might assist him in the performance of duties, such as, helping teachers to improve their teaching methods, disciplining unruly pupils, dealing with parents, relaying instructions to teachers, reporting needs for equipment and supplies, giving examinations, and reporting the tardiness and absence of pupils.

The superintendent, because of the increasing problems, caused by the rapid growth of enrollment and the resulting demand for plant facilities, found it necessary to neglect the supervision of instruction and the inservice improvement of principals and teachers. In the growing cities the size of the job became too great for the superintendent. It was only natural that he should seek an assistant to bear a part of the many responsibilities for supervision and management. It was not difficult for the superintendent to convince his board of education of the need for assistance and to secure the appointment of a functionary whose duty it would be to relieve the superintendent of those duties which he desired to delegate. For this officer to function effectively it was necessary to give him a status subordinate to the superintendent but clothed with responsibility over the principal and teachers.

Obviously, the need for intermediary officers would be greatest in the large cities which increased in population rapidly after the civil war. Prior to 1860 only one large city had appointed an intermediary officer. Only twelve cities had made such appointments before 1900. After 1900 forty-five of the fifty-seven cities considered in this study appointed intermediary assistants to their superintendents. These appointments were generally made in response to specific needs such as the following:

The need for assistance with general administrative duties.-

The administrative problems of the early superintendent in the growing cities were very complex. The rapid increase of school enrollments brought strong demands for larger teaching staffs. Teachers had to be recruited from many places. They could not be secured as quickly as the situation demanded; they had to be interviewed, employed, assigned, and trained. The problem of building, planning, and construction needed to accommodate increased enrollments presented insurmountable difficulties. School budgets were too meager to provide the buildings which were required. Someone had to select the sites, plan for the erection of plants, employ janitors, and adjust school boundaries. The superintendent was usually expected to perform these duties. Then, too the acquisition of new school plants by incorporation of suburban areas into city limits increased the superintendent's administrative responsibilities. Moreover, when the lay members of the school committees found that school affairs infringed too much on their business pursuits and that they could not spare the time from their private enterprise, they tended to unload many of their responsibilities on the superintendent of schools. Thus, the management of city school systems became the responsibility of the superintendent. These new duties were too arduous for the superintendent to handle alone.

To make the situation even more complex, some school boards required that the superintendent visit schools at least once per month and personally appraise the order and instructional efficiency. The organization of some school systems on the unit plan, as for example in San Francisco, only added to the heavy administrative burdens of the city superintendent. Later on, the business affairs of the schools were delegated by boards of education in some cities to the superintendent of schools. It was at once apparent from these practices that the superintendent needed professional help. He could not perform the administrative duties very effectively and also give time to the supervision of instruction. Some of the administrative duties had to be delegated to assistants. Hence need for intermediary officers in city school systems developed as the means of relieving the superintendent of many of his tasks. City boards of education became cognizant of this situation and provided the necessary

assistants.

The need for intermediary officers to supervise instruction.-

The growth of instructional problems paralleled the rapid growth of city schools. The instructional services were poorly coordinated in most cities. Since the main purpose of the schools is instruction, the superintendents were particularly concerned with the development of adequate programs of instruction. They found it difficult to give a reasonable amount of time to these problems. As stated previously, they were engaged in a multiplicity of administrative problems and as a consequence could not devote as much time to instruction as was required. The assumption that principals in charge of buildings could give sufficient time and effort to supervision of instruction was not valid. Many of the principals had no training in supervisory aspects of these positions; some of them were merely head teachers without previous preparation for supervisory activities, and therefore, could not be expected in any considerable degree to contribute greatly to the improvement of the program of instruction. The superintendent held monthly or semimonthly meetings with principals and teachers, but these were insufficient. Since the number of schools, principals, and teachers increased rapidly some person had to assume responsibility for the initiation of plans for instructional improvement. The only possible persons who could meet this problem were special supervisors or assistant superintendents. Superintendents realized the urgent need for these assistants and presented their needs to their respective boards which generally responded favorably.

The need for intermediary officers to coordinate school services.-

Maintaining the general balance of the city school systems was an important responsibility of the superintendent. Careful and harmonious coordination of all factors entering into the work was vital for the efficiency of every person involved. This required organization and leadership on the part of the superintendent who was already burdened with many other tasks. He needed subordinates to take care of details and the labors in coordinating the work of all departments, divisions, and schools. No one person was able to meet all natural demands of the situation. Intermediary assistants were required to help in

coordinating the activities of the city school system.

The need for intermediary officers to assist in the training of teachers.-

The introduction of new subjects and the consequent need for teachers in these subjects called for a program of teacher training. Furthermore, the introduction of graded schools with the primary, grammar and high school levels created a program of transition from the early Lancastrian system. Teachers were assigned to definite grade levels which required special training. The superintendent was responsible for the development of an inservice training program for his staff. Then, too, the teachers who were absorbed into city school systems upon the incorporation of suburban districts were required to meet new standards of instruction. They had to be trained to meet these standards. The boards of education expected the superintendent to assemble the teachers during the school year at different schools in convenient groups for the purpose of conference, advice and instruction. This requirement was occasionally written in the by-laws (New York) of the board of education. The same practice obtained regarding the school principals.

These duties of necessity were assigned by the superintendent to his assistants who accepted responsibility for meetings, conferences, and institutes for principals and teachers. Subsequently, some of these officers became assistant superintendents in charge of instruction.

The need for intermediary officers to help teachers with new subjects.-

The changing social conditions in America brought a number of new subjects of instruction into the schools. For example, in St. Louis, Chicago, Cincinnati and Cleveland the German language was introduced into the curriculum of these city school systems. In Minneapolis, the Swedish and Norwegian languages were included in the program of instruction. Manual training, penmanship, music, drawing, and kindergarten classes were organized in some of the city schools. Practically all of these subjects presented difficulties for the regular teachers. The new subjects, with their particular teaching and learning problems, required special teachers and supervision. Teachers had to be trained for these subjects, courses of study organized, materials of instruction selected and instructional leadership provided.

The special subjects in the schools taxed the superintendent's resources. Since the school principals were unable to meet the situation, the logical step was to seek assistant superintendents for the purpose of meeting these conditions in the schools. The superintendents turned to boards of education for help in this problem. The boards of education provided assistants to help the superintendent in the administration and supervision of these new school offerings.

The need for intermediary officers to aid in articulating the work of school principals.-

Before the addition of intermediary officers to the superintendent's staff the administration and supervision of local schools depended very largely on the building principals. These principals, many of whom were only head teachers lacked the preparation which their responsibilities required. The expansion of school districts, the introduction of new subjects into school curricula, and the reorganization from Lancastrian to graded system of schools brought many administrative difficulties to the building principals. To meet these problems the principals found a variety of administrative practices, some of which were archaic and others highly unsatisfactory. Certain traditional administrative practices had been transferred from rural or suburban village areas during the incorporation of these schools into city systems. Generally speaking, there was little unity or definiteness in administrative or supervisory practices. Courses of study were in need of grading and training programs for teachers needed to be developed. Methods of instruction lacked direction and guidance; and administrative controls were not definitely established within the schools of the city system. In many schools the practices in administration were diametrically opposed to those of other schools of the city.

New York city before 1898 offers a good example of exceedingly poor articulation. Many local practices were in need of reform. Improved standards of administration had to be introduced and unified. Plans had to be prepared and introduced in practice, lines of authority established, and duties of principals clearly defined. An equilibrium had to be effected in terms of established policy without destroying individual initiative of the local principals.

In general, the whole problem of articulation of school

services was in dire need of study and solution. The superintendent could not attend to the problem and perform his many other duties. It was at once apparent that assistants were needed who could be clothed with authority by the superintendent to act in matters of articulating the school functions such as organization, instruction, and interpretation of the policies of the superintendent and the rules of the boards of education. The boards of education took cognizance of this need and approved the superintendent's recommendation for the appointment of intermediary officers.

The need of intermediary officers to help in grading the course of study.-

It is of significant importance that with the introduction of graded schools, courses of study of necessity had to be organized, graded, and implemented. The introduction of new subjects into the school curriculum accelerated the acuteness of this problem, especially in the foreign languages which were now part of school offerings. Such city school systems as Chicago, Cleveland, St. Louis, Cincinnati, and Minneapolis where large numbers of pupils were enrolled for German, Swedish and Norwegian languages, at once found that the grading of these new courses was essential. Some person other than the superintendent was required to give attention to this problem. The superintendent found it necessary to delegate responsibility for grading the courses to an assistant. The boards of education realized this need and appointed the necessary assistants to help in grading and supervising the new subjects of study. The first such position was created in St. Louis in 1865 with the appointment of an assistant superintendent to have charge of German instruction in the schools.

The primary grades organization evolved when the change was made from the Lancastrian to the graded system and necessitated a course of study for these grades. Moreover, the secondary schools in many cities had introduced many new subjects in response to popular demand and these made necessary the reorganization of courses of study.

It was impossible for the superintendent to attend to the details incident to revision, implementation, and interpretation of the program of study to principals and teachers. Intermediary officers were therefore appointed to meet these needs in order to secure the desired efficiency in the schools.

The need for intermediary officers to assist the superintendent with business problems.-

The designation of the superintendent as the chief officer of the board of education in some of the city school systems brought new responsibilities to this official. For example, the superintendent of schools in Baltimore was made an executive officer of the board of education by charter provisions enacted in 1898. Other cities followed suit, some giving the superintendent full executive powers, others only in part. As a result of these changes the superintendent acquired additional duties, mostly administrative in nature. He was required to have full charge of business affairs in some school systems; in others to administer the budget and to have charge of purchases. By having to take over business duties, the superintendent fell heir to many new problems for which he was poorly prepared. He recognized his inability to perform these business duties without study and professional preparation. The solution to the problem which he adopted was the recommendation of an intermediary officer to have charge of business affairs. The soundness of this recommendation was recognized by boards of education in several cities and the desired appointment was promptly made.

Intermediary Officers in Fifty-seven
Large City School Systems

In this chapter the rise and development of intermediary officers is traced in each of the fifty-seven large cities which reported such employees in their school systems. An effort is made to ascertain the date of the establishment of the position and the conditions which gave rise to it. The number of persons now employed as intermediary officers in each of the cities and the title of their positions were obtained from the responses to the inquiry sent to the superintendents of the cities selected for study.

Chicago.--Superintendent Josiah L. Pickard in his annual report to the Chicago board of education in 1870 complained that the duties of his office were too heavy for one man. He pointed out that in six years the number of schools had increased from eighteen to thirty-six, the number of teachers employed from 212 in 1863 to 537 in 1870. He stressed the increase of pupils during this period from 21,188 to 38,939. This rapid growth of school

personnel made the labor of supervision very difficult for the superintendent. He alone could not attend to the selection of school sites, the erection of buildings, to the adjustment of boundaries, and yet give adequate time to supervision of instruction. It was necessary to have an assistant superintendent.¹

As a result of this complaint the board of education by unanimous vote (there were twenty members then) elected the principal of the Haven School as assistant to the superintendent.² The special duties assigned to him were the general supervision of the Independent Primary Schools, and the supervision of the work of the substitutes, who, while awaiting appointment, had labored temporarily in the schools during the absence of regular teachers.

It is interesting to note that this first appointment proved unsatisfactory and was abolished after one year.³ In 1872, the position was again established and the title changed to assistant superintendent of schools.⁴

A new assistant superintendent was appointed and he served until 1876. A successor was then appointed, who served two years, and was then elected to the superintendency. At the close of his career as superintendent, in 1880, he urged the appointment of two or three assistant superintendents to supervise teachers in the schools. In support of his recommendation he stated that in Boston one assistant superintendent was employed for every 100,000 inhabitants. He cited that in Chicago there were sixty-three principals, 898 teachers, and an average attendance of 42,357. The population of the city was 530,185.⁵ He implied that Chicago ought to have five assistant superintendents.

George Howland, who became a superintendent of schools

¹Sixteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, pp. 127-128, 1870.

²Ibid., pp. 112-113.

³Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, p. 42, 1871.

⁴Nineteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, p. 19, 1873.

⁵Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, p. 38. Chicago, 1880.

in 1880, was slow to recognize the need for supervision. He believed that the responsibility for the proper conduct of schools should rest upon the principal. The board of education appeared to think differently and on May 31, 1883 elected two assistant superintendents who were to devote their time to supervision.¹ Subsequently, the board on June 19 of that year elected another assistant superintendent.²

The growth of school enrollments from 1883 to 1887 necessitated a forty-five per cent increase in school buildings, and the number of pupil stations were increased in about the same proportion. The demand for supervision was also increased. This was particularly evident in the new schools which were located at a considerable distance from the center of the city. It was at once evident that the time consumed in traveling to these schools precluded frequent visits for the purpose of supervision.³ Accordingly, the board of education instructed its Committee on Schools to increase the staff of assistant superintendents.⁴ The board of education on June 29 elected three new assistant superintendents.⁵

By 1888, the number of assistant superintendents had been increased to five.⁶ The president of the school board in his recommendations stated that each assistant superintendent should be assigned to specific duties and that together with the superintendent, George Howland, they were to form a Board of Superintendents, with daily sessions, in which each member should have a voice and vote. All questions of school policy or discipline should be discussed and determined in this Board, the superintendent, of course, to be the presiding officer and recognized head of the school system.⁷ The superintendent was to receive from

¹Proceedings of the Board of Education, p. 147. Chicago, June 29, 1883.

²Ibid., p. 170.

³Proceedings of the Board of Education, pp. 228-229. Chicago, June 29, 1887.

⁴Ibid., p. 229

⁵Ibid.

⁶Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, p. 18, 1888.

⁷Ibid., p. 18.

his assistants daily reports as to progress of school work.⁸

Later in the 1888 report the plan of supervisory organization was extended. The schools in Chicago were divided into vertical divisions and one assistant superintendent was assigned to each division.⁹ A provision in the board rules specified that each assistant visit all schools in his division at least once per year in order that he might acquire an intimate knowledge of his division, and that the board might have the benefit of separate advice and judgment of the assistants. This was done not merely as a matter of convention, but because the character and usefulness of the work of any grade depended very much upon its relations to the preceding and subsequent grades.¹⁰

In July, 1890, following the annexation of Hyde Park, Jefferson, Lake, and Lake View to the city, three of the superintendents in the annexed districts were made assistant superintendents of schools. These, with those already in service, made eight in all.¹¹

From 1891 to 1900 the number of assistant superintendents was eight for a part of the time and nine for a part of the time. In 1898 the title was changed to "District Superintendent."¹² In the meantime there had been two changes in the superintendency, E. Benjamin Andrews being elected in 1898, and Edwin G. Cooley in 1900.

Superintendent Howland in asking for additional assistant superintendents in 1888 stated that the required addition to the staff of assistant superintendents should make supervision of instruction more thorough and effective. Methods of instruction and discipline could be more carefully observed, more frequently tested, and brought more fully into the line with recent educational thought and practice.¹³

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., p. 71.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 72.

¹¹ C. Barnard and A. Miller, Assistant and District Superintendents of the City of Chicago, p. 6. Chicago: Miller Printers Co., 1916.

¹² Proceedings of the Board of Education, p. 310. Chicago, October 31, 1898.

¹³ Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 71.

Chicago had four assistant superintendents in 1926. Each had charge of a special division as follows: one for special schools, one for elementary schools, one for secondary schools, and one was assigned to administer evening and summer schools. The latter also had the responsibility over the Personnel Office.¹ Another assistant superintendent was added in February, 1941, to take charge of trade schools and special centers related to the vocational program.²

The title of assistant superintendent was changed to district superintendent in 1898. Two years later, immediately before Superintendent Cooley took office, six additional district superintendents were elected, making fifteen in all. A. F. Nightingale, who had been in charge of high schools, retained his title of "Assistant Superintendent in Charge of High Schools."³ At this time there was also an office assistant whose title was assistant superintendent, and thereafter one or more assistant superintendents were assigned to executive detail work. They relieved the district superintendents of much of the office routine work and left them free to perform their legitimate function, that of supervision.

In January, 1902, the Finance Committee's report recommended a reduction of the number of district superintendents to six. The report was adopted and the change was put into effect at the end of the year.⁴ One month later the superintendent was requested by the board to name six district superintendents to be elected, and on his naming them they were elected at the same meeting for the school year to begin after June 30, 1920.⁵

At the meeting of the board on September 26, 1906 the need for district superintendents was discussed and referred to the Committee on School Management for further study.⁶ This

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, p. 35, par. 66. Chicago, 1926.

²Proceedings of the Board of Education, p. 1128. Chicago, February 7, 1941.

³Ibid., p. 499, June 27, 1900.

⁴Ibid., p. 314, January 29, 1902.

⁵Ibid., p. 321, February 19, 1902.

⁶Ibid., p. 271, September 26, 1906.

committee sought the superintendent's advice in the matter. The committee instructed Superintendent Cooley to study the need for additional district superintendents. He reported on December 14 of the same year, advising the committee that it was imperative to employ six district superintendents in order to more adequately supervise the schools.⁷ The superintendent pointed out that a few months' trial with three district superintendents had proved very successful. Moreover, he stated that schools should be more frequently visited and effectively supervised in order to secure better teaching. Therefore, the number of district superintendents ought to be augmented.⁸

In February, 1907, the Committee on School Management made a report on "The Number and Functions of the District Superintendents," which in part coincided with the view of the Superintendent. The report had been called for because of the belief on the part of some of the members of the board that the number of superintendents should be increased. The report was deferred from meeting to meeting and was never adopted by the board.

On December 16, 1908, Mr. Cooley again brought up the question of additional help in the following report, which was adopted:

The Superintendent of Schools respectfully reports that the importance of increasing the effectiveness of the supervision of the schools has been discussed many times during the past eight years. The Superintendent has stated several times that in his opinion ten district superintendents are needed to properly supervise the work of the elementary schools. For financial reasons, however, it has seemed best to carry on the work with a smaller number. The Superintendent understands now, however, that it has been practically agreed by members of the Board of Education that, with the opening of the new year, he will be at liberty to propose an increase in the number of such assistants, and to nominate suitable persons for election to the position of district superintendent.

Accordingly, the Superintendent followed this statement with a recommendation to elect four addition members of the force. They were elected at that meeting to begin service with the month of January, 1909, making ten in all.⁹

⁷Ibid., pp. 648-649, December 19, 1906.

⁸Ibid., p. 13.

⁹Ibid., p. 470, December 16, 1908.

During six months of the year 1908, between January and September, Superintendent Cooley was absent from the office, part of the time because of ill health and part of the time to visit schools in Europe. No one was appointed as acting superintendent in his absence, but the district and assistant superintendents, at weekly meetings, acted upon all questions requiring executive decision on matters which did not demand instant action.

Superintendent Cooley resigned on March 1, 1909,¹ and was succeeded in office by Mrs. Ella Flagg Young. John D. Shoop was designated as First Assistant Superintendent.² The number of district superintendents remained at ten until March, 1913, when two additional district superintendents were elected and assigned to the special divisions, evening and continuation schools.³

Superintendent McAndrew who assumed office in February, 1924, became cognizant of the need for more effective supervision of the twenty-four senior high schools. Chicago was initiating a junior high school program in 1925 and the force of district superintendents at that time was fully occupied in caring for and ironing out the difficulties incident to these schools. The senior high schools, according to the superintendent, should have their work unified and better supervised by a district superintendent.⁴

The superintendent's plea for a high school district superintendent was granted by the board by electing William J. Bogan to that position. This marks the beginning of the policy of assigning intermediary officers to have charge of high schools.

The fortunes of intermediary officers in Chicago schools received a serious setback in 1933. The board of education in an effort to reduce expenses passed a resolution eliminating the positions of four district superintendents.⁵ Subsequently in July of the same year, the board in its "economy drive" reduced

¹Proceedings of the Board of Education, p. 725. Chicago, February 24, 1909.

²Ibid., p. 66, July 30, 1909.

³Ibid., p. 977, March 20, 1913.

⁴Ibid., p. 827, May 11, 1925.

⁵Ibid., p. 953, January 30, 1933.

the number of assistant superintendents from five to three.⁶ Not until 1936 were the intermediary officers restored to the previous number.

Superintendent William H. Johnson upon taking office petitioned the board for more supervisory help in the high schools because there were thirteen new high schools transformed from junior to senior divisions. He stated in effect that:

The superintendent of schools recommends that the authority be granted to create positions for two additional district superintendents in the high school division, employment to begin on September 14, 1936.

Reason: Thirteen new high schools were opened since July, 1933, but no provision was ever made for adequate supervision of these schools. The contemplated reorganization of the high school courses together with the many projects and experiments to be carried on in the high schools made necessary this additional supervision.

This petition was granted and two district superintendents were appointed to take charge of high schools. Each was assigned fourteen high schools to supervise. Subsequently two additional high school district superintendents were appointed.⁸ In 1940, the fifth one was appointed. On October, 1945, there were five high school district superintendents, each with eight high schools to supervise. There were nine district superintendents in the elementary division each with approximately thirty-five schools.⁹

Philadelphia.--Philadelphia is the only city of the group studied where assistant superintendents were elected at the same time as the superintendent.¹⁰ In other cities, the assistant superintendents were appointed when it was felt that the duties of the superintendents were too numerous and complex to enable him to give sufficient time to supervision. Four assistant superintendents were elected in Philadelphia with the first superintendent in 1883, and the superintendent was given the duty of

⁶Ibid., p. 24, July 12, 1933.

⁷Ibid., p. 40, July 22, 1936.

⁸Ibid., p. 36, 1938.

⁹Directory of the Chicago Principals' Club, pp. 9-11, 1945-1946.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, p. 11. Philadelphia, 1883.

planning the work to be done by the assistants. The superintendent presented names of two women and two men for the positions of assistant superintendents.¹¹ These persons were drawn from the Philadelphia school system. The superintendent thought best to nominate persons from the local talent.¹² Since local people had better knowledge of the conditions under which the work of the assistant superintendent was to be carried on, the persons considered to be best acquainted with it were those who worked in the Philadelphia schools. Moreover, the superintendent thought that such distinction as belonged to the position should be given as a reward for the services that local educators had rendered.¹³

It is significant that neither of the four persons recommended by the superintendent for the position of assistant superintendents had had experience or training for the positions they were to fill. The superintendent, however, said that regardless of their lack of formal preparation, their long service in the local system and "other" qualifications would more than offset the paucity of formal training.¹⁴ With respect to sexes, and the qualifications of women for the position of assistant superintendent, a controversy arose among the members of the board of education. Some thought that women should be excluded, while others thought that women possessing proper qualifications could render equally valuable service in the work of supervision.¹⁵ Finally, a compromise was reached, and the choice of persons was left entirely to the superintendent.¹⁶

The chief duties of the early assistant superintendents were supervisory. The superintendent in planning the duties for his four assistants debated whether their work should be, to use the technical term, "perpendicular or horizontal" in its operation. The authorities in educational administration at that time did not agree as to the relative merits or demerits of the plans. The superintendent finally decided that best results might be obtained from the "horizontal" mode of supervision.¹⁷ The circumstances of the administrative set-up in Philadelphia was of such a character that the only alternative seemed to be the adoption

¹¹Ibid., p. 12.

¹²Ibid., p. 13.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁶Ibid.

of the horizontal plan of supervision. Accordingly, it was decided that the two women were especially fitted by "natural aptitude" and past experience to deal with primary instruction.¹⁷ The city was divided into two districts. To each of these districts were assigned two assistants -- a man and a woman. The primary schools in each district were placed under the direction of the woman assistant and the secondary and grammar schools were in charge of the man, with the understanding, however, that boundaries between the different districts or categories of schools were not to be absolute and that each assistant superintendent should lend such help to each other as occasion demanded.¹⁸

With the expansion of geographical limits of the city of Philadelphia it was necessary to divide the city into ten geographical divisions with a district superintendent in charge of each district.¹⁹ This official is virtually the superintendent of a city unit. These line officers are classified as central office executives. Eventually the divisions were consolidated and there are now seven district superintendents. Their function is to coordinate the educational activities between the assistant superintendent in charge of elementary schools and the principal. The policy with reference to the relationship of district superintendent and the principal has caused some confusion. The fact that twenty per cent of the elementary and junior high school principals revealed ignorance as to their relationship to the district superintendent added to the confusion.²⁰ When so large a percentage of principals manifest such wide variation in their understanding of official relations with the immediate superior officer, doubt is raised with regard to the effectiveness of their working relations. This point is more fully discussed in the chapter on "Powers and Duties Recommended for Intermediary Officers." Reavis shows in his study of the Philadelphia schools that confusion exists on the part of district superintendents in

¹⁷Ibid., p. 14

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Public Education, First District Comprising the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the year ending December 31, 1883, p. 8.

²⁰Ibid.

regard to their specific relations with educational and non-educational departments.¹

San Francisco.--In the report of 1867, the superintendent for San Francisco, after writing at considerable length on the burdens and complexities of his duties, requested that he be given an assistant superintendent.² The pressure of business duties prevented him from performing the more legitimate and appropriate duties of visiting schools.³ By 1874, a deputy superintendent was appointed, and his duties, which were almost entirely supervisory in nature, were defined by the rules of the board of education.⁴ The deputy, according to the rules, was to act under the general direction of the superintendent, but an examination of regulations governing the office of the deputy superintendent reveals that he was very definitely responsible to the board of education, especially to its Committee on Classification.⁵ These regulations specified that the deputy was to have, under the direction of the Committee on Classification, the direction of the annual examination of the grammar schools. On request, he was to make to the committee and not to the superintendent a written report on the examinations; and at the close of the school year the deputy was to include a report of his school visits, the results of the examination, and the conditions of the schools in general. The superintendent was by-passed in this respect.⁶

The San Francisco school board had had for a period of time a unique plan for supervision, although the superintendent was not an advocate of the plan. In 1885, the board of education

¹William C. Reavis and Others, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities, p. 192. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Vol. XXI, No. 66. Washington: Department of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association, 1937.

²Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 63-65. San Francisco, 1867.

³Ibid., pp. 64-65.

⁴Rules of the Board of Education and Regulations of the Public Schools of San Francisco, pp. 16-17, 1874.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 18.

created an office of head inspector of schools.¹ This official also was under direct control of the Committee of Classification. He was a sort of quasi-superintendent, and in fact, had more power over the teachers than the superintendent.²

Over a period of four years, between fifty and one hundred teachers were driven out of schools by this official.³ He is alleged to have terrorized the teachers with trials and public investigations before packed juries. The superintendent in reporting the practices of the head inspector did so because he felt that public opinion would demand the discontinuance of the office if the facts were known.⁴

After several differences which resulted in court cases, the head inspector, to come within the law, was nominally placed under the direction of the superintendent,⁵ but he continued to function as the agent of the Committee on Classification.⁶ Finally, when public opinion was aroused because one teacher committed suicide as a result of fear of the head inspector, the Supreme Court in California revoked the legislation which made the office of head inspector possible.

In educational matters, the San Francisco school system is organized on the unit plan. The superintendent of schools has the responsibilities ordinarily imposed on a county superintendent in California, and his duties and powers are defined by state law.⁷

A chief deputy superintendent, with both "line" and "functional" duties, four deputy superintendents and seven directors serve as intermediary officers between the superintendent and the principals.⁸

In 1944, a survey was made of San Francisco schools by Clyde Hill, and others. This survey recommended that the entire

¹Annual Report of the Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, pp. 130-132, 1892.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 132.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 132-133.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Reavis and Others, op. cit., p. 266.

⁸Ibid.

administrative set-up be reorganized. This committee stated as follows:

In a school system as large as that of San Francisco Unified School District, the office of the superintendent requires the services of assistants who are in close and continuous contact with his affairs, to whom a wide variety of special assignments may be made in addition to specific regular assignments.¹

The following changes were recommended:

(1) That the Deputy Superintendent now in use in San Francisco should be changed. The title Associate Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent should be substituted. The shift carries no implication of change in rank. It merely seeks to bring the nomenclature into agreement with general practice. This leaves the superintendent free to designate any one of the associate or assistant superintendents to serve as superintendent in his absence.

(2) In addition three associate superintendents are approved, one in charge of all non-instructional affairs, and one in charge of all instructional affairs. Each of these associate superintendents is directly responsible to the superintendent of schools for the direction and coordination of the services within his field.²

To the associate superintendent of instruction direct personal responsibility for the coordination of all staff services is assigned. Through this arrangement it is thought that all personnel engaged in staff services will have definite knowledge both of their authority and their responsibility.³ Furthermore under the direct personal supervision of the associate superintendent of instruction the several staff services are more readily focused upon and geared to the needs of the several divisions of the school system.

All business management in San Francisco schools is placed under an associate superintendent of schools in order to make certain that the individual occupying the position of business manager will also be a trained educator.⁴ Of deserving notice is the concept of administration in San Francisco schools that all business management is inseparably related to the educational program, and therefore, requires the services of one holding credentials in general administration of schools.

Additional intermediary officers were recommended. They

¹Clyde M. Hill and Others, Administrative Organization Study San Francisco Unified School District, p. 35. San Francisco: Board of Education, August 28, 1944.

²Ibid., p. 36.

³Ibid., p. 37.

⁴Ibid.

are: assistant superintendents in charge of elementary education and secondary education.⁵ Both are directly responsible to the associate superintendent in charge of instruction. The specific duties of these are discussed in a chapter on "Powers and Duties Assigned to the Intermediary Officers in City School Systems."

The survey recommendations pertaining to intermediary officers were fully adopted by the San Francisco Board of Education.⁶

Cincinnati.--In Cincinnati no intermediary officers were appointed until August, 1901. This was no doubt due to the fact that Cincinnati had so thoroughly developed the plan of supervision by principals.⁷ One of the two assistant superintendents appointed was given charge of schools conducted in the German language and the English schools in the German districts.⁸ The other was given supervision over the remaining English schools.⁹ At the close of the first year of service, the superintendent felt that the assistant superintendents had been of inestimable value to the school system. The superintendent, in his report to the board of education, mentioned the fact that both assistants had conducted regular instructions in the Teachers' Institute in September, 1901; they also had conducted meetings with principals and teachers. The first assistant, who had charge of the German schools, conducted numerous meetings with grade teachers and took part in meetings with mothers and parents and made several hundred visits to the schools.¹⁰

In a survey of the Cincinnati schools by the United States Office of Education in July, 1935, it was pointed out that the many duties which of necessity devolved on the superintendent in the unit type of organization were entirely too great a burden. A number of large cities had sought to relieve their superintendents from some of the many duties by creating the office of deputy superintendent or a lesser position sometimes called assistant to

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Seventy-third Annual Report of the Public Schools of Cincinnati, p. 14, 1902.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 42.

the superintendent.¹ The commission stated that this particular intermediary officer was needed in Cincinnati to relieve the superintendent of the large number of tasks more or less routine in character in order that he might devote his energies to the large problems of administration.²

New York City.--With the growth and expansion of New York City, there was a corresponding expansion in the demand for educational services. The population of New York City in 1825 was 166,089, in 1854 it was 675,000, an increase of three hundred per cent. The assessed valuation of property in New York City in 1825 was the sum of \$107,238,981; while in 1854 it was \$462,021,733. Thus, in twenty-eight years, the population and wealth had more than tripled.³

In view of the tremendous growth of the city population and consequent increase in school enrollments, the city superintendent found his duties exceedingly burdensome and demanding, especially in the visitation of schools. He petitioned the board of education to appoint two assistant superintendents. He also pointed out that there were 262 schools to be visited; that hundreds of teachers were to be examined, and that various incidental duties were continually arising. As a result he felt impelled to ask the board of education for two assistant superintendents.⁴

In June, 1854, the board of education in New York City appointed two assistant superintendents who were nominated by the superintendent. To one, the grammar schools were assigned, and to the other, the primary schools and departments. They were required to visit schools "frequently and periodically"⁵ to examine, to inspect, to ascertain progress, and to advise teachers and local officers regarding discipline, books, courses, and condition of school houses."⁶

¹Survey of the Cincinnati Public Schools, pp. 276-277. United States Office of Education, Report 64, Cincinnati Bureau of Governmental Research, July, 1935.

²Ibid.

³Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, p. 30, 1854.

⁴Ibid., p. 31

⁵Ibid., p. 32.

⁶Ibid.

With respect to these duties assigned to the assistant superintendents, the board of education had placed in its by-laws the following provisions:

The City Superintendent or his assistants shall, from time to time during the school year, assemble the teachers of the different schools in convenient¹ groups for the purpose of conference, advice and instruction.

In conformity with the by-laws, the principals were assembled into appropriate groups and matters pertaining to school management were explained by the city superintendent and discussed by the assistant superintendents.² In addition, a meeting of grammar school principals was held at which one of the assistant superintendents interpreted the course of study in mechanical drawing and at meetings of primary principals the other assistant superintendent explained the new course in forms and drawings.³

For the purpose of making most effective the work of conference, the whole city was divided into six districts. This division was made with reference to convenience and equalization of numbers.

The teachers in each district were divided into four sections. There being four sections in each district and each section holding two conferences, it follows that no less than forty-eight regular conferences with teachers were held by the assistant superintendents.⁴ The duration of each conference was one hour. The assistant superintendent assigned to the meeting presented the subject at some length, leaving time for questions and discussions.

In 1857, six years after the election of the superintendent, a third assistant was appointed.⁵

The City of New York, as it is presently established, came into corporate existence on January 1, 1898, through the consolidation, by act of the legislature, of Brooklyn, Queens, Richmond, the Manhattan and the Bronx boroughs, with the old city of New York. The schools of these areas were consolidated in February, 1898. The total population of New York in 1899 was 3,550,053.

¹Fiftieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, p. 21, 1891.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 121.

⁴Ibid., p. 122.

⁵Sixteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, pp. 78-79, 1857.

The schools ranged variously in size from the great city high school to the little district school house with a single room and a single teacher.¹

The methods of administering the schools in the various communities now consolidated into a single city were as various as schools themselves. For instance, in the old City of New York, there was a board of education consisting of twenty-one members, and a board of superintendents consisting of the superintendent and fifteen assistant superintendents, charged with general supervision of the schools, and the licensing and nomination of teachers.²

The system for administering these different school systems and for welding them into a single harmonious whole is found in the Charter of the City of New York³ passed by the legislature in 1898.

A city superintendent of schools who has the right to speak, but not to vote, in the meetings of the board, has also complete administrative control over borough superintendents and associate superintendents.⁴ These borough associate superintendents were known subsequently as district superintendents. The superintendent under the educational provisions of the charter had organized a board of superintendents.⁵ The city superintendent was appointed by the board of education for six years. The power of this board is of considerable importance to students of city school administration. They override the superintendent if his decisions are not in agreement with that of the rest of the members of the board. The powers and duties of the board of superintendents are:⁶

- a) To recommend to the board of education the establishment of schools, kindergartens and special features in schools.
- b) To increase or decrease number of classes in schools.

¹First Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools to the Board of Education of the City of New York, pp. 12-15, 1899.

²Ibid., p. 13

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools to the Board of Education of the City of New York, pp. 10-14, 1906.

⁶Ibid., p. 11.

- c) To nominate from eligible list for appointment, transfer or promotion all members of teaching and supervising staff.
- d) To determine merit and fitness of principals and teachers for increase in salary.
- e) To make rules for promotion and graduation of pupils.
- f) To recommend suitable textbooks and other supplies and courses of study.
- g) To assign special teachers to districts.⁷

Upon consolidation as provided by the charter of the City of New York, the board of education provided forty-six districts and appointed twenty-six district superintendents on the nomination by the board of superintendents for a term of six years.⁸

Cleveland.--The superintendent of the schools of Cleveland reported to the board of education that the introduction of graded schools had brought on many problems.⁹ Among the foremost of these was the recruitment and inservice training of teachers, since the graded schools employed many inexperienced teachers. Efforts were made to improve the situation through scheduled monthly or semi-monthly meetings with teachers. This plan did not prove very satisfactory because these meetings were too infrequent to enable the superintendent to give specific training to teachers.¹⁰ The primary grade teachers were especially in need of direction and supervision to meet the demands made upon them.¹¹ It is apparent that the superintendent's request for intermediary officers was based on needs incident to instruction. The board of education in accordance with the superintendent's recommendation elected two women to supervise the primary grades.¹²

The program of supervision was enhanced by the introduction of supervising principals. The city was divided into two districts, each being supervised by a supervising principal.¹³

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Instruction to the Board of Education, pp. 72-76. City of Cleveland, Ohio, August, 1872.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid., p. 75.

¹³Ibid.

These supervising principals were the earliest intermediary officers in the Cleveland schools.¹⁴

The introduction of German into the curriculum required a special supervising principal who was given charge of forty-seven teachers and 5,549 pupils. The superintendent in 1896 stated that intermediary officers were giving a great deal of time to the improvement of instruction. They visited schools, held grade meetings, consulted with teachers, examined classes, and gave special assistance to teachers.¹⁵ Their work was done with fidelity and skill.¹⁶ By 1900, there were 1,250 teachers as compared with 325 in 1875 in the city schools.¹⁷ The superintendent found it exceedingly difficult to supervise this staff with the small number of intermediary officers. There had been no additions to the supervisory staff since 1876. It was imperative that additional intermediary officers be employed.

In that year the school council took cognizance of the matter and relieved the superintendent of some of his duties by appointing a first assistant and a second assistant superintendent.

Perhaps no one thing did more to establish the schools of Cleveland on a permanent working basis than the new organization under the so-called federal plan.¹⁸ This plan was thought out, put into form, and presented to the Ohio Legislature by prominent lawyers and lay citizens, who secured its passage. It is relevant with respect to intermediary school officers because it gave the superintendent of instruction full power over all appointments. The main features of this law were a small board, consisting of seven members with purely legislative powers; a

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Sixtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 36-37. Cleveland, Ohio, 1896.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 56. Cleveland, Ohio, 1900.

¹⁸Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 27-28. Cleveland, Ohio, 1903.

school director, as the executive of the business department; and a superintendent of instruction with full authority in the educational department. The school council and the director were elected at large for two years. The superintendent was appointed by the school director with the approval of the school council and his tenure of office continued during good behavior.

Under this plan the schools prospered. Supervisors, assistant superintendents and teachers at once felt the security in their positions never before realized. They had a sense of freedom in their work that inspired them to high endeavor. Their best efforts were toward self-improvement, broader culture, and a larger knowledge of the things pertaining to their profession.¹⁹

In 1935, the board of education revised the administrative practices in the schools of Cleveland. The department of instruction headed by the superintendent was organized on lines combining "the line and staff," and "functional" types. Under the superintendent the subordinate officers, with their fields of activity or functions, are as follows: (1) First assistant superintendent in charge of senior high schools, evening schools, apprentice schools and Smith Hughes class. In secondary schools of the six year type, he had charge of the senior high school level of education. (2) Assistant superintendent in charge of junior high schools. (3) Assistant superintendent in charge of elementary schools.²⁰

St. Louis.--As the work of the superintendent of instruction became more complicated because of the growth and development of the schools, the position of assistant superintendent was created.²¹ The first such position was created in August, 1865, with the establishment of the office of assistant superintendent of the German department. During the year the assistant visited, as frequently as possible, the schools in which German was taught, examined classes, and made suggestions for improvement. He held meetings with the German teachers for the purpose of consulting

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Administrative Code of the Board of Education of the City School District of the City of Cleveland. Cleveland Board of Education, 1935.

²¹Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, pp. 38-39, 1866.

about methods and books of instruction.

At the time of his second report for the German department the board adopted rules governing the assistant superintendent as follows:

An Assistant Superintendent for the German Department is to be appointed, who shall take charge of classes himself and supervise all the German classes. He shall devise such plans and measures as may be expedient or necessary, and report quarterly or semi-annually to the Superintendent or the Board on the condition of said classes. He shall visit at least two schools during the week, without neglecting his classes; he shall examine the different schools and classes at the end of every scholastic year independent of the General Examination. He shall furnish the different teachers of German with instruction respecting the lessons and books and is empowered to meet with them about the best methods and other matters pertaining to his department.¹

In 1867, a second assistant superintendent was appointed in the person of Wm. T. Harris. At the suggestion of Superintendent Divoll, Harris began a general examination of conditions of the schools with respect to the mode and efficiency of the teaching of reading.²

During the months of March and April in 1867 Harris visited all the schools under control of the Board and examined different grades. He found the reading textbooks somewhat unsatisfactory. He also found defects in the teaching methods and recommended changes. Harris criticized the teaching of penmanship, history, the course of study in geography, singing, and spelling.

In 1868 Harris became superintendent and was assisted by assistant superintendents. The assistant who became the successor of Harris visited and became acquainted during the year with thirty-seven schools.³ He examined the pupils in the Spencerian writing. He also reported that "in other branches of study, the examinations at the close of the school year fully sustained the reputation of our schools."⁴

¹Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, p. 76, 1867.

²Ibid., p. 56.

³Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, p. 2, 1868.

⁴Ibid., p. 73.

At the time of the first re-appointment of the two assistant superintendents they spent all their time during school hours in visiting the schools and inspecting the work and in conferring with teachers regarding special matters pertaining to their work.

By 1872, the board of education adopted a rule defining the position of the assistant superintendent as follows:

Rule 35. The Assistant Superintendents, one of whom shall be proficient in German, shall aid the Superintendent in performing the work devolving upon him by the rules and regulations of the Board, and they shall further occupy their whole time during sessions of the schools in visiting the various departments of the same. . . . They shall, further, report to the Superintendent, weekly or oftener giving details of their observations and recommend such improvements as they deem conducive to the interests of the same.¹

In 1888 German was discontinued and the time of the superintendent of German was at once wholly utilized in the fundamental English branches.²

The number of assistant superintendents was increased to three in 1881³ and to four in 1903.⁴ Each of the four assistant superintendents visited regularly the schools of a district within the city assigned to him. The superintendent of instruction held weekly meetings with his assistants for the purpose of discussion and establishing a better program of supervision. The week's work was discussed and opportunity was provided for the assistants to obtain rulings on any doubtful questions which they had encountered during the week.

By 1915 the plan had been modified to effect an organization under which each of the four assistants had a district of a given number of schools, but one was given all the high schools in addition to some of the elementary schools. At this time John W. Withers was given the rank of assistant superintendent and assigned to Harris Teachers College, New Open Air Schools, the

¹Eighteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, p. 165, 1872.

²Ibid., p. 11.

³Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the President and Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, p. 15, 1891.

⁴Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 235, 1903.

Wyman School, and the Psycho-Educational Clinic.¹

For the school year 1921, the superintendent was assisted by five assistant superintendents and one assistant to the superintendent.² An additional assistant superintendent was added in 1922.³

A reorganization of the department of instruction was proposed by the superintendent in 1926. This recommendation was approved by the board of education. The object of the reorganization was to secure a definite placement of responsibility for all transactions in the department of instruction and common basis established and maintained for supervisory work.⁴ The new organization reduced the number of assistant superintendents from six to three and increased the number of directors of division from four to nine. The three assistant superintendents were aided by two district superintendents who had charge of various supervisors.

The board of education revised the organization of the department of instruction in 1928-29.⁵ Three assistant superintendents were appointed. One was given direction of all secondary schools including vocational schools. Under his supervision were two district superintendents and two supervisors, one for special schools and one for evening schools. The district superintendents under the guidance of the assistant superintendent had charge of the elementary schools. Another assistant superintendent was given charge of all special supervisors. The third assistant was assigned to all other educational services. The purpose of these changes was to give specialized service to all areas of the schools.

¹Official Proceedings, Board of Public Schools of St. Louis, pp. 212-213, XXII, (September 14, 1915).

²Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 194, 1921.

³Sixty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 82, 1922.

⁴Seventy-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, pp. 13-17, 1927.

⁵Seventy-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, pp. 17-19, 1929.

Again in 1929 the administrative organization was revised for the stated purpose of establishing a line of authority in connection with all school activities.¹ The assignment of administrative authority to two assistant superintendents and eight district superintendents under this revision was follows: (a) one assistant superintendent in charge of teachers' colleges; (b) one acting assistant superintendent of instruction assisted by two district superintendents in charge of high and intermediary schools, respectively; (c) one acting assistant superintendent in charge of vocational schools assisted by one district superintendent; (d) one district superintendent in charge of special and evening schools. The regular elementary schools were under four district superintendents, each in charge of a given number of schools.²

The following year nine assistant superintendents were listed.³ However, beginning with the year 1932-33, the number was reduced to eight.⁴ In 1933-34 the number was reduced to seven,⁵ in 1934-35 to six,⁶ and by 1941-42 to three.⁷ The following year the number of assistant superintendents was increased to four, each in charge of a functional area. The assistant superintendents were given general direction of the following areas within the department of instruction: (a) department of elementary schools; (b) department of secondary schools; (c) department of instruction and research; and (d) department of teacher-pupil personnel.⁸

¹Seventy-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 21, 1930.

²Ibid., p. 22.

³Seventy-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 32, 1931.

⁴Seventy-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 14, 1932.

⁵Eightieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 54, 1934.

⁶Eighty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 58, 1935.

⁷Eighty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 18, 1942.

⁸Official Proceedings, Board of Education, St. Louis, pp. 117-122, Vol. 11, July 13, 1943.

The president of the board in his annual report in 1869 recommended an increase in the duties of principals of first class schools.

I have been for some time convinced that more general duties must be imposed upon the principals of larger schools--twelve rooms or more; that supervision of all the schools below the first grade should be placed, to a large extent, under the principals of those schools to which the former promote their highest classes.¹

Superintendent Harris, writing in the same report, expressed approval of this idea.²

The plan as adopted caused twenty principals of the first class schools to serve as local supervisors of the primary schools situated in their district. Only advisory powers were delegated.³

After two years trial, the position of supervising principal was well established. In spite of the increase in his supervisory duties, the principal was required to hear not less than two, or more than four, daily recitations in the highest grade in his charge.

The guiding principle in defining the duties of supervising principals was stated by Superintendent Harris as follows:

Local supervision should not be extended so far as to encroach on central supervision, that of the general superintendent, nor so far on the other hand as to relieve of responsibility the subordinate principals. An equilibrium of these interests must be preserved. It is obvious that unless there is harmony of action between these, there cannot result any good from the endeavor of the superintendent. Independence in the proper sense of the term is to be achieved not through mutual limitation but rather through mutual agreement and concert of action.⁴

As further evidence of the established position of the supervising principal, the board adopted rules concerning their supervisory work. Such principals as designated by the board were directed to visit the schools at least once each week, confer

¹Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, p. 12, 1868.

²Ibid., p. 133.

³Sixteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, p. 9, 1870.

⁴Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, p. 190, 1871.

with the principals thereof, and report to the superintendent on a prescribed form with respect to general conditions of the schools, efficiency of teachers in discipline and instruction, classes examined and approved for promotion, any irregularities discovered, and date and amount of time consumed in each visit. The rules further required that the supervisory principals consult with the superintendent each week for the purpose of improving schools.⁵

The duties of the school principals became chiefly supervisory in 1904 and the supervisory principals were returned to their schools.⁶

In 1940, upon recommendation of the superintendent of instruction the board created the position of district principal and empowered the superintendent to assign such duties to them as he deemed proper.⁷ During that year eight such principals were appointed.⁸ However, this position was abolished two years later and all principals holding that rank were restored to their former positions.⁹

Under the plan of reorganization for the instruction department initiated in 1942, the position of district superintendent was abolished and the rank of director of education was created.¹⁰ The creation of this office enabled the department of instruction to carry on its many involved functions more effectively. The directors of education play a part in coordinating instructional activities which were previously neglected.¹¹

⁵Ibid., p. 27-28.

⁶Fiftieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 63, 1904.

⁷Official Proceedings, Board of Education, St. Louis, pp. 206-210, Vol. XLVII, September 10, 1940.

⁸Ibid., pp. 350-352.

⁹Official Proceedings, Board of Education, St. Louis, pp. 275-283, Vol. XLIX, September 8, 1942.

¹⁰Official Proceedings, Board of Education, St. Louis, p. 384, Vol. XLIX, October 13, 1942.

¹¹Official Proceedings, Board of Education, St. Louis, pp. 264-268, Vol. L, September 12, 1944.

Boston.--In 1876, a board of supervisors whose members correspond to assistant superintendents was appointed in Boston.¹ The visiting and examining of schools were listed among the duties of the individual members.² This board of supervisors was to conduct examinations for teachers' certificates. In fact, this was their chief purpose from their inception. It was proposed by the School Committee in Boston to give this board the title of Examiners. The value of this Board of Supervisors is expressed by the School Committee as follows:

Going into the schools, as the Supervisors do, without previous notification, they see the teachers at their work, and learn what their real value is. Their quickening influence to good work is incontestable . . . they endeavor to make easier to the teachers and more profitable to the scholars, by judicious hints and suggestions.³

The placing of the primary schools of Boston under supervisors drew an interesting line between the functions of supervisors and those of the principals. It was found that supervisors were expected to function as principals in the primary schools.⁴ There was considerable resentment to this on the part of early school masters. However, the superintendent in his report to the School Committee stated that whatever may have been the exigency which made the assumption of the principal's work by the supervisors a temporary necessity, experience had made it clear that such arrangement ought not to be a feature of the permanent plan of supervision.⁵

As a result of the reorganization of the school committee in 1905, the board of supervisors became the board of superintendents. Its scope of activities was considerably enlarged. The board of superintendents is comprised of the superintendent and six assistant superintendents. Individually, the assistant superintendents are field officers of the superintendent; collectively with the superintendent they constitute an advisory body

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, pp. 7-8, 1876.

²Ibid., p. 8

³Ibid.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of Boston, p. 21, 1882.

⁵Ibid.

to the school committee.¹ This is a rather important feature of the administrative organization of the Boston schools.

It is apparent that the assistant superintendents held positions of importance in the administration of the schools of Boston. They were the advisors to the superintendent and to the principal, to the former by virtue of duties assigned to him, and to the latter, by being a direct representative of the superintendent in educational matters.²

Potentially, the assistant superintendents still possess considerable control over the administration of individual schools. They are not only clothed with authority to act in matters of organization, instruction, and discipline in the schools of their respective districts but are authorized by the rules and regulations of the school committee to exercise, in their discretion, "any or all the duties assigned to directors, supervisors, principals and teachers."³

Providence.--In Providence, Rhode Island, the first intermediary officer was elected in 1885.⁴ In this city, as well as others, the superintendent proved to the School Committee that he did not have time to supervise all the schools and that he needed an assistant.⁵ The ordinance which created the office of assistant superintendent gave the superintendent power of selection.⁶ The ordinance as initiated by the School Committee in a resolution stated: "Resolved: That the Secretary be and he hereby is directed to apply to the City Council for the authority for the School Committee to appoint an Assistant Superintendent of the Public Schools."⁷

Eventually, the City Council granted the authority to the School Committee, and in 1888 the first intermediary officer was

¹Reavis and Others, op. cit., p. 17.

²Ibid., p. 23.

³Rules of the School Committee and Regulations of the Public Schools of the City of Boston, pp. 19-21. School Document No. 7, Sec. 74, 1935.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, pp. 11-13, 1888.

⁵Ibid., p. 11.

⁶Ibid., p. 12.

⁷Ibid.

appointed.⁸

In January, 1902, the president of the board of education and the superintendent of schools disagreed over the courses of study and supervision of instruction. No particular relief was given to the superintendent through the appointment of an assistant.⁹ Eventually (in March) the president because of variance with dictatorial board president was forced out of office. On April 4 of the same year, Mr. Walter H. Small, a superintendent of public schools in Chelsea, Massachusetts, was elected superintendent of schools.¹⁰ Before the new superintendent took office in July he surveyed the possibility of securing an additional assistant superintendent. Apparently he convinced the autocratic president of the board, who in his annual message given on May 28, 1902 said:

Your committee has conferred with Mr. Walter H. Small, the Superintendent Elect, regarding the appointment of two assistants to the superintendent. He properly suggests that the appointment of his assistants should be subject to the approval of an appropriate sub-committee and the assignment of their work should be placed in the hands of the Superintendent. We approve this recommendation and also suggest that the title "supervisor" has been in part misleading and a source of some misunderstanding. These persons are properly the Superintendent's assistants and should receive their title accordingly.¹¹

On May 28, 1902 the School Committee adopted the following resolution:

Resolved that the Superintendent Elect shall each year, as soon as possible after his election, appoint subject to the approval of the Executive Committee one first assistant at a salary not to exceed two thousand dollars, and one second assistant at a salary not to exceed twelve hundred dollars, such assistants to aid the Superintendent in the discharge of his duties in such manner as he shall from time to time direct. . . 12. . They are subject to removal by the Superintendent.

Strayer in a survey of the Providence schools in 1923 recommended that additional intermediary school officers should

⁸Ibid.

⁹Records of the School Committee of the City of Providence, pp. 301-302, January 31, 1902.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 333. ¹¹Ibid., p. 361. ¹²Ibid., pp. 367-368.

be appointed.¹ As a result of the survey, a deputy superintendent was appointed, a line officer in charge of instruction. The two assistant superintendents in charge of high and elementary divisions were under direct control of the Deputy Superintendent in Charge of Instruction.²

In 1929, a significant development in the superintendent's administrative staff was the addition of a second deputy superintendent. He was an executive of both educational and non-educational functions, that is, both line officer and staff officer. As a staff officer he had general control over special fields and coordinated the work of the directors of these special fields. As a line officer he was in complete charge of plant operation and plant construction and was held accountable for these functions to the superintendent of schools. One assistant superintendent was in charge of research, guidance and attendance.

Two other assistant superintendents, one in charge of elementary schools and one in charge of the secondary schools, were provided. They were directly responsible to the superintendent. Lines of authority extended from these two assistant superintendents to elementary and high school principals.³

Pittsburgh.--The history of public education in Pittsburgh reveals that principals were important school officials long before they city had either a superintendent of schools or intermediary officers. A central organization of schools in Pittsburgh was not developed until February 9, 1855, and the city superintendency was not established until 1868.⁴ The first intermediary officers were not appointed until 1912.⁵

The superintendent of schools in his report for 1909-10

¹George D. Strayer, Report of the Survey of Certain Aspects of the Public School System of Providence, Rhode Island, pp. 27-31, 1923-1924.

²Ibid.

³Reavis and Others, op. cit., pp. 251-252.

⁴Annual Report of the Superintendent of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Public Schools, pp. 27-35, 1934-1935.

⁵First Annual Report of the Board of Public Education School District of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, p. 38, 1912.

petitioned the board of education with respect to his need for intermediary officers. He pointed out that the school system has grown to its proportion by the accumulation of added units. The suburban schools, which had been acquired through annexation, came under city supervision and were expected to conform to the general requirements of the central board.¹ The need for an effective program of supervision was apparent. The superintendent could not alone supervise the schools of forty-six independent subdistricts and the work of fourteen hundred teachers.² It was necessary to employ several assistants to help the superintendent. In view of this need the superintendent asked the board to elect five assistants, but was informed that his recommendation was in conflict with the legal prerogatives of the board.³

The superintendent's plea was not regarded favorably and the matter was tabled by the board of education.

In the First Annual Report to the board of education the superintendent presented a picture of conditions which existed before his election to the superintendency. He reported that the organization was unique and exceptional. In 1911, two distinct school city systems (Alleghany and Pittsburgh) were under general supervision of independent central boards. The local boards had control of local ward schools and had exclusive authority over selections of principals and teachers.⁴ In the words of the superintendent, "Each local board became a law unto itself, and each teaching body, as a rule, reflected the spirit and interest of the board members."⁵

The organization became so involved, cumbersome, and inefficient that it was changed by legislative act in 1911. The City of Pittsburgh was constituted a district of the first class on May 18, 1911. S. L. Heeter was selected to be its superintendent. He began to reorganize the system, but found the task difficult and was retained only one year.

Upon the appointment of a successor to Heeter, the board

¹Reports Concerning the Public Schools for 1909-1910, City of Pittsburgh, pp. 25-26, Vol. 41.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴First Annual Report of the Board of Public Education School District of Pittsburgh, pp. 20-22, 1912.

⁵Ibid.

of education elected in March, 1912, an associate superintendent and four assistant district superintendents.⁶ These officers had supervision over several schools aided by assistant principals in each separate building. This situation obtained until 1914 when William M. Davidson was appointed superintendent of schools. He developed a line and staff organization which still prevails in Pittsburgh.

In 1933, the state legislature of Pennsylvania revised the school laws. The school code contained the following provisions with reference to intermediary officers:

Section 2224: Supervision of all matters pertaining to instruction in all the schools, under the direction and subject to the approval of public education, shall be vested in the superintendent of schools, associate superintendent, assistant district superintendents, and school principals.

Associate and assistant district superintendents may be appointed by the board of school directors upon the nomination of the superintendent of schools. . . . They shall be under the supervision and direction of the superintendent of schools.⁷

Detroit.--The superintendent of schools in Detroit, Michigan,⁸ recommended to the board of education July 24, 1919 that in order to perfect his organization for the next school year it would be necessary to appoint a deputy and an assistant superintendent. The following action was taken by the board:

Moved by Inspector Alfred, supported by Inspector Mumford, that in view of the situation as presented by the Superintendent of Schools, he be asked to nominate the deputy superintendent and an assistant superintendent.⁹

The motion was carried by a vote of five to one. The superintendent then nominated a deputy superintendent and an assistant superintendent and his nominations were approved.

The principals in the Detroit school system, stimulated by the superintendent formed two committees, which after a year's study, recommended certain improvements in the supervision of instruction. They criticized the current practice of the supervisory program pointing out that supervisory visits were largely

⁶Ibid.

⁷School Laws of Pennsylvania, pp. 155-156. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Department of Public Instruction, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1933.

⁸Minutes of the Board of Education, City of Detroit, p. 49, July 24, 1919.

⁹Ibid.

observations and that in most cases no constructive criticism was offered. The supervisory visits were not directed toward definite needs. No common ground for appraisal between teacher and supervisor were found. The principals devoted too much time to administrative duties and depended too much on the specialists for the supervision of teachers.¹

The committees made the following recommendations in April, 1922, to the board of education:

(1) That the system of district principals now in existence as an experiment unit on the east side of the city be developed by the superintendent as a permanent part of his administrative policy.

(2) That the superintendent be instructed to extend this organization to the west side for the ensuing year in the same manner as on the east side this year, viz:²

That principals are appointed to this position for probationary period of one year only with no extra compensation.

That they be given the title of District Principals and must pursue such courses in education as the Superintendent may require.

That the powers of District Principals shall be the same as those of assistant superintendent (within the district).

That his (District Principal's) actions shall be subject to approval by the assistant superintendent in charge of elementary schools.³

This report was ordered printed in the board of education proceedings and laid on the table.

The office of district principal had been established on an experimental basis in 1920.⁴ This experiment was considered a success and the board of education adopted it as general policy the same year. Each district principal was responsible for his own school in addition to the other schools in his district. The original purpose of a district principal retaining responsibility over a single school was to keep him in closer touch with the practical problems of the principals.

Buffalo.--Prior to 1837 there was practically no unified public education system in Buffalo. Principals or "schoolmasters", as they were called in those days, ran the schools much as they

¹Minutes of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, pp. 425-426, April 22, 1920.

²Ibid., p. 427.

³Ibid., p. 426.

⁴Seventy-seventh Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Michigan, p. 34, 1920.

saw fit. The only restraining forces were the city officials. Although Buffalo is credited with having appointed the first city superintendent of schools in the United States, it did not dignify the position, as evidenced by the fact that the first superintendent resigned at the end of the year, and the second appointee declined to serve.¹ There were many abuses in the Buffalo schools largely in the matter of appointing principals and teachers. This led to a law in 1854 which made the superintendency an elective office. In 1916 the first board of education was established. Up to 1930 there was no direct line of authority throughout the school system.

In 1930 the schools of Buffalo had six deputy superintendents: three in the field of elementary education; one in vocational education; one in charge of business matters; and one in charge of evening schools, summer schools, extension services, and special classes. In the elementary field deputy superintendents were in charge of primary grades, intermediate grades, and upper grades.

The Buffalo Municipal Research Bureau which conducted a survey of the Department of Education in 1930 made the following recommendation:

In the opinion of the survey staff the organization could be simplified by having one deputy superintendent in charge of the kindergarten elementary schools and one in charge of secondary school field for both general and vocational education. In addition, there should be a deputy in charge of business, as at present. There should also be a deputy superintendent in charge of research. In addition to these, there should be necessary field assistants. The superintendent by this arrangement would have found direct lines of approach to the members of his staff.²

The board of education in 1936 passed By-Laws and Regulations,³ affecting intermediary officers as follows: It abolished the title deputy superintendent in two cases and retained two. The two new intermediary officers were designated as associate superintendents.

Baltimore.--The Council of the City of Baltimore passed

¹Reavis and Others, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

²Report of the Buffalo School Survey, Part I, p. 34.
Buffalo, New York: Buffalo Municipal Research Bureau, 1930.

³By-Laws and Regulations of the Board of Education,
Buffalo, New York, Sec. 13, 1936.

an ordinance in April, 1872, providing for the appointment by the Board of Education of a suitable person to be the Assistant Superintendent of Public Schools.¹

The Council found it necessary to define the duties of the first intermediary officer as follows:

Sec. 9. It shall be the duty of such Assistant Superintendent of Public Schools to aid the Superintendent in the supervision of the public schools of the city; he shall visit the primary schools as often as his duties will permit, and make a report of such visits to the Superintendent; he shall assist in the examination of classes of primary and grammar schools, and be subject to such rules and the regulations as the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools may establish.²

The superintendent nominated an assistant and the board approved the superintendent's choice.³ In their annual report to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, the school commissioners requested three additional assistant superintendents.⁴

As a result of this petition, the city schools were given what is known as an Educational Charter under the Baltimore City Charter adopted in 1898. This Charter provided for a board of school commissioners, a superintendent of public instruction, and one or more assistants.⁵ The wording of the provisions with respect to intermediary officers gave the school board an unlimited power as to number of assistants.

Upon the request of the superintendent two additional assistant superintendents were appointed in 1906, making a total of three assistant superintendents.⁶

¹Extracts from Statutes and Ordinances Relating to the Public Schools of Baltimore, No. 50, p. 191. (Found in 70th Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools of the City of Baltimore, 1899), Ordinance of April 22, 1872.

²Ibid., Sec. 9.

³Report of the Commission to Study the System of Education in the Public Schools in Baltimore, Maryland, Bulletin No. 4, p. 26, Chapter 1, 1911.

⁴Seventy-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, pp. 24-25, December 31, 1895.

⁵Seventy-eighth Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, p. 35, 1906.

⁶Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction Baltimore Board of Public School Commissioners, pp. 34-36, January 1, 1906.

The school system of Baltimore in 1945 had four assistant superintendents and no other intermediary officers.

Newark.--In his report to the board of education in 1905 the superintendent recommended the appointment of an assistant superintendent to help direct the labor and energies of nearly 50,000 children enrolled in the day schools and 8,000 more in the summer schools, and an equal number in the evening schools so as to secure the greatest possible output in wisdom, intelligence, virtue, patriotism, and productive capacity.¹

The board of education approved the superintendent's petition for the appointment of an intermediary officer.² The superintendent in his report subsequently said that he was greatly appreciative of the board's action.

By 1937, the school system of Newark had developed many kinds of special services and there were appointed between 1950 and 1937 additional intermediary officers for the purpose of discharging the administrative and supervisory activities more efficiently.³ There was a deputy superintendent in charge of instruction and three assistant superintendents assigned to functional duties. At present there are three assistant superintendents; the need for a deputy has been eliminated by the absorption of his duties by the assistant superintendents.

Kansas City, Missouri.--The superintendent of schools in Kansas City in his report for 1892-1893 complained to the board that he was devoting most of his time to visiting schools and was finding little time for other school matters.⁴ As a result of this situation the board appointed an assistant to the superintendent in 1894. The assistant was to help the superintendent in the many administrative details. This situation continued until 1898 when the board took cognizance of the fact that school enrollments had increased greatly. There were approximately 23,000

¹Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Newark, New Jersey, pp. 150-151, 1905.

²Ibid., p. 152.

³Reavis and Others, op. cit., pp. 101-102.

⁴Twenty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of Kansas City Public Schools, p. 43, 1892-1893.

pupils enrolled in the schools during this year. Supervision was being neglected. The superintendent requested additional assistants to improve the program of instruction. The board of education responded by appointing two assistant superintendents.¹

In October, 1945, the Kansas City school system had one associate and one assistant superintendent.

Milwaukee.--Appointment of the first assistant superintendent in Milwaukee was authorized by an amendment to the charter law of 1888.² The growth of the Milwaukee school system had been reflected in the increase in the number of principals. The superintendent, though in direct relation with the principal needed additional assistance.³ Therefore, as the school services expanded the superintendent secured the appointment of intermediary officers. At the present time there are four assistant superintendents in the Milwaukee system. They are responsible to the chief educational executive, the superintendent.

Washington, D. C.--From 1869 to 1900, the schools in the District of Columbia had two superintendents, one for the schools for the white children and the other for the schools for colored. This resulted in considerable confusion due to lack of coordinated policy of administration. The situation existed until 1900, when, by an act of Congress, the office of superintendent of colored schools was abolished, thereby putting all the schools under a single superintendent.⁴ The act further provided that two assistant superintendents shall be appointed, one of whom, under the superintendent's direction, should be in charge of colored schools, and the other in charge of white schools. With the increase of administrative responsibilities the two assistant superintendents were advanced, in 1924, to the rank of first assistant superintendents. These two officers acted as deputies for the

¹Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Education of the Kansas City Public Schools, p. 14, June 30, 1900.

²Charles McKenny; Educational History of Wisconsin, p. 67. Chicago: The Delmont Co., 1912.

³Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of School Directors of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 16-17, 1918.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, p. 13, 1900-1901.

superintendent in the instructional affairs of their respective divisions. This was modified in April, 1943.¹ The first assistant superintendent for white schools became the superintendent's chief deputy in that division of the school system. The first assistant superintendent for colored schools likewise became the chief deputy in his division. Both deputy superintendents, as provided in the rules,² are officially subordinate in rank only to the superintendent of schools; they are superior in rank to every other administrative and supervisory officer in their divisions of the school system.

In 1924, a business manager was appointed, and in 1925, the board of education classified the business manager as an assistant superintendent.³ In 1929, a first assistant superintendent was appointed to take charge of the business department. He is the superintendent's chief deputy in business administration.⁴

The administrative staff includes several other intermediary officers. Since 1925, there have been two assistant superintendents in charge of educational research: one for white schools and one for colored schools.

In April, 1943, the name assistant superintendent was changed. This change in the nomenclature did not make the intermediary officers less important; on the contrary the new law provided that their salaries be adjusted and the name changed to associate superintendent.⁵ The two previously mentioned deputy superintendents have been retained as chief deputies to the superintendent.⁶ In 1946 there were six associate superintendents and

¹Rules and By-Laws of the Board of Education of the City of Washington, D. C., chap. iii, sec. 2, par. 7, April, 1943.

²Ibid., sec. 3, par. 8.

³Report of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, p. 11. Washington: United States Printing Office, 1929.

⁴Rules and By-Laws of the City of Washington, D. C., Schools, p. 4, adopted April 7, 1943.

⁵Rules of the Board of Education of Washington, D. C., Public Schools, chap. iii, sec. 6, par. 1, April 7, 1943.

⁶Ibid., chap. iii, sec. 2.

nine district supervising directors. These latter officers hold an important and prominent position in the administration and supervision of schools.

Minneapolis.--The first mention of an intermediary officer in the Minneapolis schools is found in the superintendent's report to the board of education, July 26, 1892. "Previous to 1886 the supervisory force consisted of a superintendent and assistant superintendent, together with special teachers. . . ."¹

Records reveal that the early intermediary officer was an assistant to the superintendent. His office was dispensed with in 1892.

In his report for 1911 to the board of education the superintendent of Minneapolis schools requested the appointment of three assistant superintendents.²

These intermediary officers were needed because of the several new features which had been added to the schools during the year. One of the most important was the assignment of an ungraded teacher to all buildings of twelve or more rooms.³ Then, too, the standard of qualifications of teachers had been raised both for grades and high school. The introduction of many changes in summer and vacation schools and the expansion in curriculum offerings, such as the introduction of Swedish and Norwegian languages, all added to the burdens of the superintendent's duties. Therefore, the immediate need for assistant superintendents was evident.

The director of research of the Minneapolis schools reported in October, 1945, that the school system has three assistant superintendents.

Denver.--The first intermediary officers in the Denver schools were appointed December 1, 1902.⁴ The superintendent in his statement to the board pointed out the need for assistants

¹Fifteenth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Minneapolis, Minnesota, p. 84, July 26, 1892.

²Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Minneapolis for the Year Ending July 30, 1911, p. 45.

³Ibid., pp. 35-36.

⁴First Annual Report School District No. One in the City and County of Denver, Colorado, p. 2, 1903-1904.

when the school board was given jurisdiction of schools in Arapahoe County. This provision was created with the reorganization of School Laws in the State of Colorado under the famous twentieth amendment to the Constitution of the State of Colorado, adopted November, 1902 and declared effective by the Governor December 1, 1902.⁵

During this time there were seventy school buildings. Seven of these principals taught full time. There were 103 instructors and four principals in high schools. There were also in the Denver school system sixty-eight kindergarten teachers, nineteen manual training, and six German teachers, also two teachers of domestic science.⁶ Thus, the need for assistant superintendents was apparent.

In 1916, Professor Franklin Bobbitt who had conducted a survey of the Denver Schools made the following recommendation with respect to assistant superintendents:

To keep the general balance of this large and complicated educational machine running true in all of its parts is a task large enough for the strongest of men, and important enough for all of his labors. Such careful and harmonious coordination of all of the factors entering into the work is a vital necessity for efficiency on the part of every portion of the organization. He needs subordinates to take care of all detailed labors.

The thing needed is that organization and leadership that will vitalize everything and everybody within the school system. . . . Qualified assistant superintendents in charge of instruction will pay their way many times.

The board needs now to employ an Assistant Superintendent in charge of business affairs, as recommended and nominated by the superintendent.⁸

These recommendations were accepted by the board and up to October, 1945 the Denver School System had appointed four intermediary officers--all assistant superintendents--one in charge of the business and three of instruction.

Rochester.--The superintendent recommended in 1903 the

⁵Ibid.

⁶Second Annual Report of School District No. One in the City and County of Denver, Colorado, p. 6, September 30, 1905.

⁷Report of the School Survey of School District No. One in the City and County of Denver, pp. 42-45, 1916.

⁸Ibid.

appointment of an assistant superintendent.¹ The first assistant superintendent to be appointed to the Rochester schools was a woman.² She continued in her capacity of supervisor of kindergarten and primary grades combining these duties with that of an assistant superintendent.

In his report to the board of education for 1908 through 1910 the superintendent referred to his needs for additional assistant superintendents. He stated that no one person could longer pretend to meet all natural demands of the situation. The responsibilities of his office had greatly increased during the last few years. There had been enormous development in evening school, vocational work, and special classes.³ The responsibility in administration had increased in a corresponding degree; community standards constantly demanded more exacting supervision. The supervisory program demanded a series of meetings and conferences with principals, teachers and patrons of the school. The superintendent further stated that other cities the size of Rochester employed at least two assistants for general supervision. He asked for two male assistant superintendents to render aid in supervision and administration of the day and evening schools.⁴

The board of education approved the superintendent's request and appointed one assistant superintendent to have charge of auxiliary services and the supervision of upper grades.⁵ In October, 1945 the school system in Rochester employed three intermediary officers.

New Haven.--The board of education voted in the spring of 1912 to change the existing system of supervision. Under the old plan of supervision, each supervising principal served as a building principal of the school where his headquarters were

¹Fifty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of Rochester, New York, pp. 34-35, 1903-1904.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Rochester, New York, pp. 36-37, 1908-1909.

⁵Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Rochester, New York, p. 335, 1911-12-13.

located, taught one hour each day, under the rules of the board, and supervised the work of his district in the regular grade subjects of the school.¹

By the change which took effect in September, 1913, sub-district school lines in the city were abolished and the office of the supervising principal was discontinued. For the general supervision instead, there were appointed three assistant superintendents.² These intermediary officers were to work from the office of the board of education and were to devote their entire time to the supervision and direction of the work of the schools. They were responsible for teachers' institutes by grades and by subjects for the purpose of explaining, directing and clarifying the work in the different subjects.³

The principal reason for the change in supervision was that, in the opinion of the Board, the old system, deemed satisfactory when each district consisted of only two or three buildings, had become inadequate with the rapid growth of the city. In case it had been decided to continue the old system, two or three additional districts would have been necessary, which would probably have been more expensive than the system adopted. It was found, furthermore, that, with the growth of the city, different districts came to differ considerably in the qualify and efficiency of the work.⁴ The new system as it was thought by the superintendent would improve the supervisory program because "of centralization and uniformity."⁵

Duluth.--The first reference regarding intermediary officers in the schools of Duluth is found in the superintendent's report to the board of education for the year 1915. He states, that when the schools opened that year the board elected an assistant superintendent who was assigned to supervise instruction.⁶ The value of this appointment proved exceedingly satisfactory and

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of New Haven, Connecticut, for the Year Ending December 31, 1913, p. 31.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 34.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Duluth, Minnesota, p. 28, December 31, 1915.

beneficial to the progress of instruction.⁷

By May, 1922, the schools of Duluth had grown considerably. There were thirty-four principals of elementary, junior and senior high schools, each of whom in matters of administration dealt directly with the superintendent. This confined the work of the superintendent to details of administration and consequently prevented him from giving proper attention to the development of policy and sufficient time for the general supervision of the entire educational program. This situation, according to the superintendent, had come about through the fault of no one. It had just grown as the size of the program had expanded, in an effort to keep in touch with modern educational ideals.⁸ These conditions warranted consideration by the board of education in appointing assistant superintendents. The superintendent pointed out that he needed one assistant to have charge of elementary education and research and one in charge of secondary education. Both of these intermediary officers, if appointed, were to have charge of supervision in their respective divisions and such other duties incident to their departments as the superintendent might assign to them.⁹

In compliance with the superintendent's recommendation, the board of education elected two assistant superintendents; one to have charge of elementary schools and the other to have charge of secondary education.¹⁰

One year before the appointment of the above-mentioned intermediary officers, the board of education had elected an assistant superintendent to have charge of grade supervision and vocational education. Thus, by 1923, the Duluth school system had four intermediary officers. In October, 1945, only two intermediary officers were reported.

New Bedford.--The first mention of an intermediary officer in New Bedford, Connecticut, is found in the superintendent's plan for better supervision. In his report to the board of education for 1906 he said that for some years he had felt that it was

⁷Ibid.

⁸Annual Report of the Board of Education of Duluth, Minnesota, p. 67, 1923.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

impossible for him as a superintendent to give to the various schools that close supervision which was necessary to secure the desired efficiency in any system of schools.¹ He had, therefore, requested an assistant who should serve in a special capacity of supervisor of primary grades. The request was granted and an appointment was made in 1905 of one who had had large experience in schools.²

In the first seven months in office this assistant made 867 visits to classrooms.³ She noticed that many teachers did not understand the course of study and hence failed to interpret it to the children. This first intermediary officer, a woman, who was referred to as a supervisor of primary grades, had reorganized and brought about order in the grade schools of the city.

San Diego.--The school enrollments in San Diego increased from 11,000 to 28,000 in a period of ten years (1914-15 to 1924-25). The superintendent in his report to the board of education for the years 1919 to 1925 stated that he anticipated an increase in enrollment, and also that in the establishment of junior high schools, new problems in administration and supervision had arisen.⁴

The increase and improvement of the means of education for the adult and foreign speaking population had also added heavy burdens to the superintendent's responsibilities. He, therefore, requested assistants to help in his duties.⁵ The board of education elected two assistant superintendents, one to control the business department and to act as a secretary of the board, and the other to devote his attention to the work of instruction in the grades and junior high school.⁶

Fort Worth.--The president of the Fort Worth Board of Education, Clay Johnson, in his report for the year 1915 made the following recommendations with respect to the need of intermediary officers:

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of New Bedford, Connecticut, pp. 161-162, 1905.

²Ibid., p. 109, 1906.

³Ibid., p. 119, 1906.

⁴Report of the Superintendent of Schools of San Diego, California, p. 10, July 1, 1919 to July 1, 1925.

⁵Ibid., p. 28.

⁶Ibid.

In order that the plans of the Superintendent of Schools be properly carried out, I recommend that two more supervisors be selected. . . . These supervisors can attend to many details of supervisory work not possible for the Superintendent who is almost constantly occupied with other and larger matters. They can render splendid service in the matter of rating correctly the work of both teachers and pupils more especially that of the teachers.¹

It is apparent, then, that the first intermediary officers in Fort Worth were concerned chiefly with the supervisory aspects in the schools. The first assistant superintendent had been appointed in September, 1914, prior to the above mentioned request.

Atlanta.--The first assistant superintendent in Atlanta, Georgia, was appointed on September 1, 1891.² In 1941-42 Superintendent Willis A. Sutton reported that the increase of duties and the extension of services necessitated additional intermediary officers. In October, 1945,³ Atlanta schools had an assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs; an assistant superintendent in charge of high schools; and an assistant superintendent in charge of elementary schools.

Richmond, Virginia.--The first mention found pertaining to an intermediary officer in Richmond was in the annual report of the superintendent of schools for the year 1904-05. He stated that he had requested the board at the beginning of the past school year to release the principal of the Marshall school for half time supervision of the schools in his section of the city on the ground that the work of the superintendent had become so heavy that he was unable to give the schools the attention which they required.⁴ The board of education recognized the need for an assistant and elected a first assistant superintendent in November, 1904. The assistant was assigned to the supervision of instruction.⁵

¹Manual of the Fort Worth, Texas, Board of School Trustees, p. 29, September, 1916.

²Twentieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Atlanta, Georgia, for the Year Ending December 31, 1891, p. 3.

³Ibid., 1941-1942.

⁴Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Richmond, Virginia, p. 18, July 31, 1905.

⁵Ibid., p. 22.

In his first report to the superintendent of schools at the end of the first year the assistant stated that he had given special attention to reading, spelling, and discipline in the different schools.⁶

St. Paul.--The first intermediary officer in the St. Paul schools was appointed assistant superintendent in August, 1900.⁷

With respect to the need for this new officer the superintendent said that, "It is not well to discuss less supervision but seek for better."⁸ With regard to kinds of supervision, the superintendent continued:

I am not sure that it is certainly determined how much supervision is really needed, but when the question is finally answered and acted upon I have no doubt there will remain all that can be wisely exercised. We may not answer the question now, but we can take note of what we have, viz: A general superintendent and an Assistant Superintendent⁹

It is apparent that the first assistant superintendent was a supervisor of instruction. He was chosen because of his previous successful supervision in the field of penmanship.

Los Angeles.--The first intermediary officer to be appointed in the Los Angeles schools was a deputy superintendent in 1899. The superintendent in his report to the board for 1899 said:

It is not surprising that a charter prepared for a city of 50,000 people and 11,000 school children should prove inadequate for a city of more than 100,000 people and 30,000 school children. The greatest need for effective school work in our city are supervision and accommodations.¹⁰ Last year we gained 26.46 per cent in school enrollment.

The board acted on this matter and assigned the new deputy superintendent to act under the direction of the superintendent. The deputy was assigned to supervisory activities, mainly to improve and oversee instruction.¹¹

⁶Ibid.

⁷Forty-second Annual Report of the Board of School Inspectors, St. Paul, Minnesota, p. 41, year ending June, 1900.

⁸Ibid., p. 43.

⁹Ibid., p. 41.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools of the City of Los Angeles, California, p. 52, 1899.

¹¹Ibid., p. 132, 1900.

The comments of the superintendent regarding this appointment were as follows:

The census of 1900 gives Los Angeles 102,000 people or 52,000 more than in 1890. In 1890 we had 178 teachers and the present school year finds us with 525 teachers. This great gain in population and teaching force has added much to the work of the school administration. The people expect more of the schools. . . . I believe your honorable body showed good judgment in adding an Assistant Superintendent to our office force for next year. Because of the large number of new teachers who come to us each year, additional supervision is necessary.¹

In 1934 the University of Southern California made a survey of the Los Angeles schools. The survey commission made a very important observation with respect to the needs for intermediary officers. This commission pointed out that the administrative area of the Los Angeles schools embraced 1,000 square miles. This precluded any possibility of the central administrative office keeping in close touch with the particular needs of this vast school district.² Moreover, the paucity of administrative and supervisory personnel made difficult a close articulation of all educational services.³ Several pertinent recommendations were made by the survey commission incident to intermediary officers. In the first place, it recommended the establishment of an office of associate superintendent who should serve in the capacity of assistant general manager to carry out the work of coordination of the various departments for the superintendent of schools.⁴ Furthermore, it was advised that the assistant superintendents be assigned to the new positions of district superintendents. There should be seven of these intermediaries, each of whom should be responsible for all the educational activities of the section of the city to which he was assigned.⁵

The survey commission took cognizance of the poor centralization of responsibility for instruction and recommended the creation of an office of deputy superintendent. This officer was

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools of Los Angeles, California, p. 61, 1900-1901.

²Osman R. Hull and Willard S. Ford, Survey of the Los Angeles City Schools, pp. 27-36. Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles City School District, 1934.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

was to be responsible for all centralization of instructed services.⁶

The board of education accepted with modifications these recommendations and completed the reorganization. By October, 1945, the Los Angeles school system had one associate superintendent, one chief assistant superintendent, and eight associate superintendents, each in charge of an elementary district.⁷

Houston.--The schools in Houston according to the superintendent's report for 1905-06 had introduced a departmental system of instruction and consequently found an urgent need for a more adequate program of supervision. Moreover, some of the business affairs of the schools were placed in the superintendent's hands and he was greatly in need of an assistant to handle this work. Therefore, the board of education elected an intermediary officer who was assigned to business duties for part of the time and was assigned to the supervision of primary grades for the remainder of the time.⁸ This arrangement continued until 1939 when the board elected an assistant superintendent for the purpose of aiding the superintendent in supervision and administration.

Springfield, Massachusetts.--The report of the survey of the Springfield schools in 1923 made an important reference to the need for an assistant superintendent.

A school system the size of Springfield should have in addition to the heads of these separate divisions an Assistant Superintendent of schools especially competent in some one or more fields with which the Superintendent has to do, but primarily one who can represent him in all of his functions.

Such an Assistant Superintendent of schools should be appointed by the School Committee upon nomination of the Superintendent of Schools at the earliest possible moment. Without such support the superintendent will undoubtedly find himself so driven by the multiplicity of duties imposed on him as to find it impossible to render the type of service of which he is capable.⁹

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Houston, Texas, pp. 20-21. Found in the Annual Report of the Board of Education, 1905-1906.

⁹George D. Strayer, Report of the Survey of Certain Aspects of the Public School System of Springfield, Massachusetts, p. 33. New York City: Columbia University, Teachers College Publication, 1924.

On September 9, 1925 the board of education appointed its first assistant superintendent of schools.¹ The superintendent subsequently reported to the board that the assistant had begun his work in a very superior manner showing unusual fitness for this important post.

The data presented regarding the appointment of intermediary officers in the fifty-seven cities considered in this investigation reveal that several types of intermediary positions between the superintendent and his school principals have been established. These positions were intended to meet emergency problems in the city school systems. The titles of the officers and the number of individuals now employed in each type of position in the cities studied are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

TITLES OF INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS IN FIFTY-SEVEN CITIES
OF 100,000 POPULATION AND OVER, NUMBER OF CITIES
USING THE TITLES, AND NUMBER OF INTERMEDIARY
OFFICERS EMPLOYED IN 1945

Officers	Number of Cities Using the Titles	Number of Inter- mediary Officers Employed in 1945
Deputy Superintendent	6	6
First Assistant Superintendent	1	1
Chief Deputy Superintendent	1	2
Chief Associate Superintendent	1	1
Associate Superintendent	7	25
Associate Assistant Supt.	2	8
Assistant Superintendent	53	172
District Superintendent	3	22
District Supervising Principal	2	16
Total		253

The findings disclose a total of 253 intermediary officers in the fifty-seven cities under nine different titles. Six cities

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Springfield, Massachusetts, pp. 10-11, 1925.

have deputy superintendents, one in each city; one city Washington, D. C., has two chief deputy superintendents; one city, Los Angeles, California, has one associate superintendent; seven cities have twenty-five associate superintendents; two cities, Los Angeles and Philadelphia, have eight associate assistant superintendents.

The data reveal that fifty-three of the fifty-seven cities have assistant superintendents. The total number of these intermediary officers in the fifty-three cities is 173; three cities employ twenty-two district superintendents; two cities, Washington, D. C., and Somerville, Massachusetts, have sixteen supervising principals.

The distribution of the 253 intermediary officers in the fifty-seven cities is classified in four population groups as presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS IN CITIES
GROUPED ACCORDING TO POPULATION

(1940 CENSUS)

Groups of Cities by Population	Number of Cities in Each Group	Number of Intermediary Officers Employed in 1945
Above 1,000,000	5	98
500,000 to 1,000,000	9	51
250,000 to 500,000	17	51
100,000 to 250,000	26	53
Total	57	253

The data reveal that there are ninety-eight intermediary officers in five cities with a population of one million or higher. These cities are New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles. Nine cities with population of 500,000 to 1,000,000 have fifty-one intermediary officers. Seventeen cities with population ranging between 250,000 to 500,000 have twenty-six intermediary officers; the twenty-six cities between 100,000 to 250,000 population have fifty-three intermediary officers. The

thirty-one cities with a population of 250,000 or over have two hundred intermediary officers.

The fourteen cities with large urban population of 500,000 or over have 139 intermediary officers. This group of fourteen large cities represent approximately twenty-five per cent of all the cities and have fifty-four per cent of the total number of intermediary officers. Cities with population of 100,000 to 250,000 represent approximately forty-six per cent of all the cities in this study and have twenty per cent of the total number of intermediary officers.

These cities classified according to population groups with the number of intermediary officers employed according to the decades in which the offices were established are represented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

DECADES IN WHICH POSITIONS OF INTERMEDIARY
WERE ESTABLISHED AND NUMBER OF OFFICERS
EMPLOYED IN 1945 IN FIFTY-SEVEN CITIES

Dates	Number of Intermediary Officers Employed by Decades	Number of Cities
1850 to 1859	3	1
1860 to 1869	3	2
1870 to 1879	4	2
1880 to 1889	20	4
1890 to 1899	9	3
1900 to 1909	48	10
1910 to 1919	39	8
1920 to 1929	68	13
1930 to 1939	51	11
1940 --	8	3
Totals	253	57

The data reveal that approximately eighty per cent of the cities established positions for intermediary officers between 1899 and 1940, and that approximately ninety per cent of the intermediary officers employed are found in the cities which

established the intermediary administrative positions during the period indicated.

The highest number of intermediary positions established was in the decade 1920 to 1929. Over half of the positions (214) were established during the three decades 1900-09, 1920-29, and 1930-39.

Summary

The reports of the superintendents in the fifty-seven cities studied show that conditions existed in the growing school systems which required the addition of professional officers between the superintendent of schools and the principals of the local schools. Duties of the superintendents were so arduous that without the aid of intermediary assistants problems in need of solutions in the local schools had to be neglected. The principals, generally, had meager training for administration and supervision; there was a paucity of articulation of school services; verbal or written instructions could not be substituted for school visits and the personal appraisal of situations in local schools. Someone was required to visit schools and to confer with principals and teachers in order that solutions might be found to the existing problems. The reports show that these problems were numerous and complex. For instance, the expansion of urban district boundaries and the acquisition of suburban schools required the personal attention of the superintendent incident to problems of incorporation of children, teachers, buildings, and budgets of the city system. The rapid expansion of school enrollments required that new buildings be planned and constructed, teachers recruited and trained, and the necessary machinery of administration set up. The introduction of new subjects into the school curriculum called for special training which required the assistance of functionaries above the principals.

Moreover, when the lay school committees ceded their functions to the superintendent he found a multiplicity of administrative problems which required his immediate attention, among these were: pupil accounting; assignment of teachers and principals; selection of textbooks and equipment; conferences with principals, teachers and patrons of the school; and all the incidental clerical work connected with his office. As the urban school systems grew it was at once evident that the superintendent

could not give the time which the improvement of instruction required. The organization of schools in large cities was rapidly becoming cumbersome and involved. No one officer could possibly handle the work which was required to be done. The change from Lancastrian to graded schools brought on more administrative and supervision problems. Teachers had to be trained, especially in the primary grades. The brief meetings which the superintendent conducted with them were too infrequent and insufficient in scope. In this function the city superintendent was urgently in need of help.

The superintendent's problems also multiplied when he became the chief executive officer of the board of education. There were added to his office in several cities, the responsibility for business affairs of a city school system. He needed an assistant for this new function.

The superintendents requested help in the form of assistants for different duties to be performed by his office. Accordingly, the boards of education elected the necessary assistants which were classified in accordance with the types of functions which they were to perform, some for administrative and others for supervisory duties. They were variously designated as: deputy superintendents, first assistant superintendents, chief deputy, chief associate, associate, associate assistant, assistant, district superintendents, and supervisory principals.

The need for these officers was acute in the early stages of development of the large city school systems from 1900 to 1920. During this period eighty-seven intermediary officers in eighteen large cities were appointed. Most of these early officers were assigned primarily to duties incident to the improvement of instruction. In this function they made an excellent contribution and relieved the superintendent of many details so that he could devote more time to policy making. The fact that the largest number of the intermediary officers were needed in larger cities is natural. The problems in these cities were more extensive and complex because of the influx of population and the consequent expansion of school services.

In general, the emergency of these new school administrative officers on the scene of rapidly expanding urban school systems included in this study was inevitable. The appointment of intermediary officers was an important development in the administration and supervision of large city schools.

CHAPTER III

POWERS AND DUTIES ASSIGNED TO THE INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS IN CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Sources of Materials

The materials on which this chapter is based were secured for the most part directly from the superintendents of school systems in fifty-seven cities. Letters with a detailed questionnaire were mailed to each of the superintendents. Ninety-two letters and questionnaires were sent out; fifty-seven replies contained information bearing on the problem of the investigation. From these, and from the Annual Reports of the boards of education, Handbooks of Rules and Regulations, and the Annual Reports of superintendents the data utilized in the chapter were secured.

Duties of Early Intermediary Officers

The primary purpose of any type of internal school organization should be the improvement of instruction. The responsibility for guaranteeing the attainment of educational purpose through administration rests with the superintendent of schools and he is responsible for setting up a form of organization that will produce the improvement of instruction in a city school system. In the fifty-seven cities considered in this study, intermediary officers are a part of the organization. They were appointed for the specific purpose of improving administration and supervision.

At this point it is necessary to define the essential difference between administrative and supervisory duties. Writers in the field of educational administration very generally agree that administration is essentially a service activity, a tool or agency through which the fundamental objectives of the educational process are realized. In the development of this point of view the teacher emerges as the most important agent, with administration in the position of ministering to his needs and thus

increasing the efficiency of teaching.¹ This interpretation considers administration a means to an end. Supervision is merely one of the totality of acts involved in an effective program of administration.²

The influence of scientific thought in education; the tendency toward democratic attitudes, beliefs and procedure; and the extension of the practice of distributing supervisory duties among a larger number of persons have brought about a clarification of the basic concepts in the field of supervision. Barr makes the following generalization with respect to supervision.

Supervision of instruction deals with those things which primarily and rather directly condition learning. In more specific terms supervision may be divided into three major functions. They are: (a) Studying the Teaching Learning Situation; (b) Improving the Teaching Learning Situation; and (c) Evaluating the Means, Methods, and Outcomes of Supervision.³

This definition clearly breaks with the earlier narrower concepts of supervision, inspection, and prescription. The newer concept centers supervision on the teaching-learning situations. The teacher becomes a cooperating member of a professional group concerned with the improvement of learning.

The concepts presented provide a background for the relations of administrative and supervisory responsibilities assumed by the intermediary officers in fifty-seven cities.

Supervision Emphasized as Duty of Early Intermediary Officers

Between 1860 and 1890 the intermediary officers appointed were considered preeminently as supervisors of instruction. Their appointments were predicated upon the need of improving instruction. The following statements substantiate the fact that supervision of instruction was a dominant issue with the superintendents in the fifty-seven cities in this study.

The Superintendent of Schools in Chicago in 1869, upon his petition to the board requesting an appointment of intermediary

¹Arthur B. Moehlman, School Administration, p. 5. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1940.

²Ibid., p. 281.

³A. S. Barr, William H. Burton, Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision, pp. 20-21. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938.

officers said: "The labor of supervision increases more daily than increase in numbers would indicate. . . ."¹

The Baltimore School Council in April, 1872, stated: "It shall be the duty of each Assistant Superintendent of Public Schools to aid the Superintendent in Supervision."²

The duties of the early assistant superintendent of schools in St. Louis, Missouri, were to visit and supervise the thirty-seven schools.³ In 1890 the superintendent petitioned the board for more supervisory aid, stating: "Over sixty-one thousand pupils were enrolled in the public schools during the year and these were taught by twelve hundred and nine teachers including principals and supervisors."⁴

The influence of the American Institute of Instruction was apparent with respect to the needs for supervision in city schools. In its annual session held in Boston in 1869, it passed a series of resolutions relating to supervision.⁵

The substance of these resolutions was that the judicious and thorough supervision of public schools conduces to their efficiency and promotes the highest welfare of society.⁶ Moreover, it was considered impossible to evaluate the schools to the highest standard without careful supervision.⁷ The schools were regarded as of such value that they demanded thorough and wise supervision.⁸

Superintendent Andrew J. Rickoff of Cleveland, Ohio, schools stated in 1872 that: "Teachers in the primary grades need instruction, direction, and constant supervision in the performance

¹Sixteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, pp. 127-129, 1870.

²Extracts from Statutes and Ordinances Relating to the Public Schools of Baltimore, p. 191. Found in Seventieth Report of the Board of Public School Commissioners, 1890.

³Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, Missouri, p. 73, 1868.

⁴Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of St. Louis, Missouri, p. 13, 1890.

⁵Journal of Proceedings of American Institute of Instruction, p. 26. Portsmouth: American Institute of Instruction, 1869.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 14.

⁸Ibid., p. 24.

of their delicate and difficult task."¹

Superintendent I. M. Greenwood of Kansas City, Missouri, in his annual report to the board of education said: "The close, exact, intelligent and concentrated supervision that touches every teacher and all the pupils in a school counts. The best supervised schools are still in the lead."²

The need for supervision was recognized by the president of the board of education in Detroit as early as 1863 in a statement to the board to the effect that supervision was necessary for the successful operation of schools.³

Minneapolis had an interesting development in its supervisory program. In 1891, the superintendent insisted that principals be given exclusive supervisory control over several buildings.⁴

In Philadelphia four assistant superintendents were appointed in 1883; two were assigned exclusively to supervisory duties in grammar and primary schools.⁵

Chicago in 1869 elected its first assistant superintendent of schools. He was given the general oversight of the independent primary schools and the supervision of the work of the substitutes.⁶

The duties of the deputy superintendent appointed in San Francisco in 1874 were almost entirely supervisory in nature.⁷

The first intermediary officer in St. Paul, Minnesota, appointed in 1900 was assigned to the supervision of instruction.

¹Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Cleveland, Ohio, p. 103, 1873.

²Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of Kansas City Public Schools, p. 37, June, 1898.

³Twenty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, p. 101, 1863.

⁴Fifteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Minneapolis, p. 8, 1891.

⁵Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, op. cit., p. 14.

⁶Sixteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, Illinois, pp. 112-113, 1870.

⁷Rules of the Board of Education and Regulations of the Public Schools of San Francisco, California, pp. 16-17, 1874.

The superintendent in assigning the duties stated: "It is not well to discuss less supervision, but seek for better."¹ It is important to note that the first intermediary officer in St. Paul was selected largely because of his eminent record as a supervisor of penmanship.²

In Los Angeles, California, the comment made by the superintendent regarding the appointment of an assistant superintendent was: "I believe your honorable body showed good judgment in adding an Assistant Superintendent to our office, because a large number of teachers need supervision."³

Supervising principals have played an important role in the efforts of superintendents to develop a program of supervision.⁴ The superintendent of Boston in his report for 1866 reminded the school committee that more than a year had passed since he recommended that grammar school masters be given supervisory responsibility for the primary schools in their districts.⁵

The board of education in Washington, D. C., passed a series of regulations set up for governing supervising principals.⁶ Under these regulations the supervising principals were designated as local superintendents of all the schools in their respective districts.⁷

The foregoing statements indicate that the first intermediary officers were charged with duties pertaining chiefly to supervision. These statements serve to indicate the magnitude and intensity of the problems in instruction and the necessity for the employment of intermediary officers for the purpose of

¹Forty-second Annual Report of the Board of School Inspectors of St. Paul, Minnesota, p. 41, 1900.

²Ibid., p. 41.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education and Superintendent of Los Angeles, California, p. 61, 1900-1901.

⁴Thomas McDowell Gilland, The Origin and Development of the Power and the Duties of the City School Superintendent, p. 104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

⁵Report of the School Committee of Boston, Massachusetts, pp. 154-155, 1866.

⁶Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of Public Schools of the City of Washington, p. 308, 1874-1875.

⁷Ibid.

improving instruction through supervision.

It is significant that the first intermediary officers were expected to interest themselves in supervision rather than administration. The period between 1854 and 1890 was a period in which intermediary officers found their major responsibilities in connection with the improvement of instruction. The majority of their responsibilities pertained to supervision and the smallest number pertained to administration.

Changes in Functions of Intermediary Officers

The necessity for expert supervision was generally recognized and amply provided for in the early stages of the development of city school systems. However, in time several factors brought about a shift in emphasis to administration. These factors were: (a) the rapid development of city school districts and consequent expansion of school services; (b) the designation of the superintendent as an executive officer of the board of education; (c) the adoption of school grading; (d) the establishment of the principal as the administrative and supervisory head of his school; and (e) the introduction of special subject supervisors.

With the expansion of the geographical limits of the city of Philadelphia it was considered necessary by the Board of Education to divide the city into ten geographical divisions and to appoint a district superintendent in each division. These officers were classified as administrators.¹

The population in New York between 1825 and 1854 increased three hundred per cent.² The superintendent felt impelled to ask the board of education for two assistant superintendents stating that they were needed to visit the 262 schools of the city and to examine new teachers.³

The designating of the superintendent as the executive officer of the board of education in certain cities placed on the superintendent many administrative duties. This necessitated a

¹Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Public Education, First District, composing the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, p. 8, December 31, 1883.

²Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 5.

³Ibid., p. 31.

modification of administrative organization within the systems. When the boards of education reduced in size the number of its committees, it at once entrusted more administrative responsibility to the superintendent. These changes required more of the superintendent's time for matters purely administrative in nature.

The superintendent of schools in Rochester, New York, in asking for relief from the many administrative duties stated in his Annual Report:

As has been indicated elsewhere in this report, the responsibility of the executive of the board has greatly increased. The responsibility in administrative has increased in corresponding manner. In view of these additional responsibilities the superintendent recommends that an assistant be appointed to aid in these duties.¹

The St. Louis school board made the superintendent of instruction an executive officer in 1897² and placed important administrative responsibilities on him. The immediate responsibility for the administration of the local schools was delegated to the intermediate officers who were considered the logical persons to assume many of the responsibilities.³

The evidence indicates that when the superintendent was designated as an executive officer of the board of education he was definitely placed in authority for the administration of the schools. The boards of education in city schools, however, after they relinquished administrative duties to the superintendent, sometimes with doubt, ruled that they be kept informed by the superintendent on the conditions of schools by means of an annual report or as often as practicable by periodic reports. The superintendent had to rely on the intermediary officers for information concerning the conditions of the local schools.

The establishment of the principal as the administrative and supervisory head of the school in the closing decades of the nineteenth century placed on him many of the supervisory duties previously performed by the early intermediary officers. To some degree it lessened the supervisory functions of the intermediary officer. Superintendent Howland of Chicago in discussing this

¹Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Rochester, New York, p. 335, 1911-12-13.

²Annual Report of the Board of Education of the St. Louis Schools, pp. 11-13, 1897.

³Ibid., p. 12.

point said:

The prime factor in the success of individual schools is the Principal, and no amount of itinerant supervision can supply his place. Any authority coming in to supercede him in the management of his school must depreciate his influence and lend to the injury of the school.¹

The development of the graded system of schools in the large cities probably could not have been brought about effectively if the superintendent had not had adequate assistance. In some cities the gradation brought about duties which the superintendent did not anticipate.

Another very important problem of administration which the superintendent acquired was the Lancastrian system of school organization, which flourished in certain parts of the United States during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The adoption of the Lancastrian system in some cities was clearly the responsibility of lay administration. When the superintendent became the executive officer, the problem of administering the Lancastrian schools was his. The large classrooms of the Lancastrian school buildings were poorly adapted to the plans of grading the schools. The Lancastrian system thus became an exceedingly difficult problem for many superintendents to solve. This aspect of administration became, in many cities, the dominant administrative concern of the superintendent. In Cleveland, Louisville, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, New Haven, New York, and St. Louis, cities whose schools had been operated for a time on the Lancastrian plan,² grading brought about a need for additional intermediary officers to help solve the problems of transition from the Lancastrian to the graded system of school organization.

As new subjects were introduced into the school curriculum it frequently became necessary to elect special teachers to teach these subjects. These "special" teachers, later as the school systems increased in size, became supervisors of the subjects in which they had special training. Needless to say, the intermediary officers as a result were now given more administrative duties and less of supervisory responsibility. For example,

¹Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, pp. 57-58, 1884.

²Thomas McDowell Gilland, The Origin and Development of Powers and Duties of the City School Superintendent, pp. 76-77, Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

one of the early intermediary officers in St. Louis supervised penmanship. By 1884 this was the responsibility of a special supervisor.

In the report for 1884-85 the superintendent of the Detroit schools stated: "It is my conviction, based on experience, that penmanship, drawing, and music were better taught by specially trained teachers. . . . I, therefore, recommend the employment of special teachers."¹

The appointment of special teachers necessitated the reorganization of school programs which became the responsibility of intermediary officers.

Analysis of the Duties Assigned to Intermediary Officers in Fifty-seven Cities

Buffalo.--Two associate superintendents are assigned to have charge, one of the secondary education including vocational and continuation schools; and the other the elementary schools. They are held responsible for:

Reports on conditions of schools, special duties assigned to them by the superintendent; supervision of principals and directors; examination of records of teachers; reports on physical needs and teacher absences; and generally be responsible for the administration of schools and courses of study.²

Boston.--The administrative officers in Boston are charged with the following activities:

They shall be members of the Board of Superintendents and are the direct representative of the superintendent in the schools, districts, departments, or activities to which they are assigned. As such they may exercise full authority not contrary to the rules of the School Committee. They may at their discretion exercise any or all of the duties with respect to organization, instruction, and discipline. Section 74 of the rules permits the Assistant Superintendent to visit schools under the direction of the superintendent for the purpose of obtaining information regarding the efficiency of the schools.³

Atlanta.--The business manager, who is an assistant superintendent, holds a higher rank in terms of succession than the

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, pp. 73-74, 1884-1885.

²By-Laws and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of Buffalo, pp. 8-11, 1936.

³Rules of the School Committee and Regulations of the Public Schools of the City of Boston, pp. 19-21, Document 7, 1934.

other two assistant superintendents. The specific duties of these officers are:

The assistant superintendents shall conduct with the cooperation of principals and teachers complete and continuous surveys of the situation in the various schools to the end that constructive surveys may be made in the curriculum, the promotion and classification of pupils. One shall be in charge of Business Affairs, one in charge of Senior High Schools, Vocational and Special Schools, and one in charge of the Elementary Schools. They shall have authority over all matters pertaining to the various departments indicated in their respective titles.¹

Duluth.--The duties of the assistant superintendent are defined as follows:

He shall be under the direction of the superintendent of schools and shall have such administrative and supervisory duties as agreed upon and assigned to him in conference with the superintendent. The most important of these duties is the visitation of classrooms and instruction, and it is to that he should give the major portion of his time.²

Cincinnati.--The rules and regulations for the Board of Education of Cincinnati prescribed that the assistant superintendent in charge of the department of administration shall administer the policies of the board with respect to the use of school buildings; select teachers including substitutes, assign teachers to their respective duties; supervise school funds and requisitions; and in general assist in securing good organization necessary for educational progress.³ The other assistant superintendent is in charge of the Department of Instruction. He is expected to administer the instructional program and maintain a program of supervision and in-service education for teachers for the purpose of improving instruction.⁴

Des Moines.--The school board of the city of Des Moines, Iowa, adopted on February 19, 1924, the following rule with respect to the duties of intermediary officers:

¹By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of Atlanta, Georgia, Article 2, sec. B, 1939.

²Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of Duluth, Minnesota, p. 17, sec. 10A, adopted July 28, 1936.

³Rules and Regulations of the Cincinnati Board of Education, p. 15, sec. 38, adopted July, 1944.

⁴Ibid., p. 17, sec. 3.16.

Section 1 - Article IV - Assistant Superintendent
During the brief absence of the Superintendent of not to exceed two months an Assistant Superintendent designated by him shall act as superintendent. In case of a prolonged absence of the Superintendent, the Board shall designate the person to act as the superintendent.¹

San Diego.--The school regulations delegated the following duties to the assistant superintendent in San Diego.

An Assistant Superintendent shall perform such duties as the Superintendent of Schools may direct.

The Assistant Superintendent shall have direct and immediate responsibility for the following duties, as the Superintendent may assign:

Specifically, they shall attend regular meetings of the Board of Education, and upon request shall attend special meetings. They shall be active members of an Executive Council, and under the direction of the Superintendent they shall organize and direct such departments as are required for the efficient management of the schools, and as are approved by the Board of Education.²

Pittsburgh.--The Manual and Handbook for Principals and Other Administrators for the City of Pittsburgh states that:

Direct powers with reference to duties of assistants emanate from the superintendent. Only in exceptional instances has the Board of Education defined in detail the powers and duties of an associate superintendent. Generally he shall have charge of certain designated work and of such other work as the superintendent finds it necessary to assign to him from time to time.³

One of the associate superintendents in Pittsburgh is assigned to administer the high schools, one to administer the elementary schools, and one to have charge of salary scheduled, and all matters pertaining to personnel in connection with the public schools.

Cleveland.--In Cleveland the duties were divided in the following manner in 1925. The first assistant superintendent was to act as superintendent in case of the superintendent's absence and also to have administration of senior high schools, evening schools, apprentice and Smith-Hughes classes. The second assistant superintendent was to have charge of junior high schools; the

¹By-Laws of the Board of the Independent School District of Des Moines, Iowa, sec. 1, Article IV, 1924.

²The Administrative Code of the San Diego Schools, sec. 10, Article II, pp. 10-12, revised and adopted August 7, 1939.

³Manual and Handbook for Principals in City Schools of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1940.

third assistant superintendent was given charge of all elementary schools, kindergarten, penmanship and speech correction. The rules provided that no other duties could be added to the aforementioned unless the rules were changed.¹

Erie.--The duties of the assistant superintendent in Erie, Pennsylvania, were almost exclusively administrative in nature. His duties were assigned by the superintendent. In Section five of Rule forty-five, the assistant is charged with the duty of visiting schools as often as may be advisable and practicable.² He is to observe instruction, discipline and check on attendance, also inspect equipment and supplies, and report to the superintendent on overcrowded conditions.³ In the absence of the superintendent the assistant assumed the powers and performed the duties of the superintendent of schools.⁴ He was also required to attend all committee meetings as well as the regular monthly meetings of the board and to make a monthly report to the board at each regular meeting of conditions observed by him.⁵

Indianapolis.--The Board of School Commissioners of the city of Indianapolis adopted on June 30, 1942 specific rules for the government of its schools and libraries. With reference to the intermediary officers, the rule stated that they were to be responsible for the administration of those phases of the educational program assigned to them by the superintendent. They were also expected to be responsible for the direction and coordination of all activities of all members of the administration and supervisory staff work in their fields, and for the effectiveness of the program for which they were directly responsible to the superintendent.⁶

Kansas City, Missouri.--The rules of the Board of Education are exceedingly general regarding the duties of the assistant

¹Administrative Code of the Board of Education of the City of Cleveland of the City School District, secs. 211-212-213, July 1, 1925.

²Extracts from the Pennsylvania School Code, Rules, Regulations and Resolutions, p. 24, Rule 45, 1929.

³Ibid., sec. 5. ⁴Ibid., sec. 2. ⁵Ibid., sec. 6.

⁶Rules of the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, p. 15, sec. 2, Article 4, June 30, 1942.

superintendent. These rules merely state that the assistant superintendent shall assist the superintendent in the discharge of his duties, and perform such other duties as the board or the superintendent may direct.¹

Long Beach.--The deputy superintendent of schools in Long Beach, California, is next to the superintendent of schools, the chief executive officer of the board of education. In the absence or incapacity of the superintendent of schools, the deputy is to assume all powers and duties of the superintendent. He is required by the rules to attend all board meetings. In addition, the deputy has such administrative and supervisory powers as are assigned to him by the superintendent of schools.²

Milwaukee.--The assistant superintendents in the schools of Milwaukee are required to assist the superintendent of schools in the discharge of the duties devolving upon him. They shall be under his direction and perform such duties as he may require.³

Louisville.--The school board of Louisville requires its assistant superintendent to pay particular attention to the classification of pupils. He is also responsible for the enforcement of board rules, required to visit schools as often as practicable, and for the apportionment among the classes of the prescribed course of study. Moreover, this intermediary officer is responsible for reports on the conditions in schools with respect to methods of instruction employed for the success of the teachers and for suggestions pertaining to the improvement of the course of study.⁴

New Bedford.--The two assistant superintendents in New Bedford, Connecticut, each serve as administrators of a department, one in charge of secondary schools and the other of the

¹Rules and Regulations of the School District of Kansas City, Missouri, p. 30, Rule No. 40, 1936.

²Administrative Code and the Rules and Regulations of the Long Beach City Schools, p. 20, sec. 12, Article IV, 1939.

³Rules and Regulations of the Board of Directors of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, p. 15, Article 3, 1924.

⁴Laws and Legislation of the Public Schools of Louisville, Kentucky, p. 16, Secs. 16-18, Article VI, June, 1939.

elementary.¹ The rules do not specify in detail except to say that: "This department is under immediate direction of an assistant superintendent."²

Minneapolis.--The rules for 1933 of Minneapolis Public Schools provide for an assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs, but this office no longer obtains. The director of administrative research in a letter dated October 11, 1945 states that the assistant superintendents are responsible for carrying on the inservice training program and also for supervising the work of the principals. One of the assistant superintendents is responsible for special services such as health, Child Study Department, visiting teachers, and attendance. He does not have responsibilities for any phase of the business administration.³

Oakland.--The board of education in Oakland, California, provides in its rules and regulations for 1936 twenty-two long paragraphs of rules for the insurance advisor and only the following statement regarding the duties of the two assistant superintendents:

The Assistant Superintendents of Schools shall perform the duties assigned to them by the Superintendent of Schools, and one of them shall be assigned by the Superintendent to act as Superintendent of Schools in his absence.⁴

New York City.--In New York City the duties of intermediary officers are defined both collectively and individually. The collective pattern of rules pertain to the Board of Superintendents which has considerable power under the Charter of the City of New York enacted by the legislature in 1898. This board consists of all the borough superintendents and the powers and duties of the Board of Superintendents are:

¹Rules and Regulations and Salary Schedules of the New Bedford Public Schools, pp. 28-30, 1938.

²Ibid.

³Charter Rules and Regulations of the Minneapolis Public Schools, sec. 2, Article IV, p. 28, 1933.

⁴Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of Oakland, California, p. 6, Rule 41, 1936.

To recommend to the Board the establishment of schools. To increase or decrease number of classes. To nominate from eligible list for appointment, transfer or promotion all members of teaching and supervisory staff. To determine the fitness of principals and teachers for increase in salary; to assign special teachers to districts; and to make rules for promotion and graduation of pupils.¹

The thirty-three assistant superintendents each have charge of a definite district and are held accountable for the following duties: Administrative functions involving pupil housing; interpretation of policies and regulations; classification and promotion of pupils, checking on school budget; distribution of test materials, bulletins and audio visual equipment; recommending school sites; revising school districts; inspecting school plant equipment and supplies; and administering problems relating to personnel.²

Supervisory activities are exercised as follows: Establishing morale among teachers and supervisors; setting up professional growth; encouraging experimentation; interpreting the course of study; and pooling of professional resources through workshops, study courses, and demonstrations. The assistant superintendents are expected to encourage and develop initiative and resourcefulness; and to coordinate the instructional services; and finally by example and study to develop professional contacts in civic and welfare groups interested in serving the best interests of the children.³

The deputy superintendent's duties are supervisory, but most of his time is occupied with the administrative channels. He is to assist the superintendent and to act as the superintendent during the latter's absence. The associate superintendents have divided duties, that of administration and supervision. They have administrative and supervisory duties in connection with work of the assistant superintendent and divisional heads. They have line authority over the field superintendents.

Peoria.--The assistant superintendent in Peoria, Illinois, was appointed in 1941 and the Rules and Regulations and Charter

¹Eighth Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools, op. cit., pp. 10-14.

²Ibid., pp. 12-13.

³Report of the Committee of the Association of Assistant Superintendents of the City of New York, pp. 5-8, Appendix A, 1942.

of the Board of School Inspectors of Peoria for 1930 and subsequently up to 1940 to not include the duties of this officer. However, the superintendent of schools reports in the questionnaire of October 5, 1945 the following duties for the assistant: (a) To assist the superintendent; (b) to supervise special service departments, vocation, and other schools; and (c) to have charge of educational personnel.

Providence.--Three intermediary officers, a deputy and two assistant superintendents are employed in Providence. The deputy superintendent according to the amended rules shall assist the superintendents in matters relating to the general supervision of the schools and shall report to him and consult with him in connection with the details of administration. He shall assume the duties of the superintendent in case of illness or absence. The duties of assistant superintendents, two in number, consist of general administration and supervision, one for the senior and junior high schools; and the other for the elementary schools and all problems incident to efficient operation of these schools.¹

Sacramento.--On March 3, 1941 the Board of Education of the Sacramento, California, City Unified District adopted the following rule pertaining to the duties of intermediary officers:

Deputy Superintendent's duties will point downward into the schools as the Superintendent's duties point upward to the Board, to the law and to the public. The Deputy Superintendent shall serve as an immediate subordinate to the Superintendent and in the transaction of business within the school system access to the Superintendent shall be through the Deputy's office.²

The deputy is to assume the duties of the superintendent in case of absence or inability of the latter to perform his duties; serve as district administrative superior to assistant superintendents; assist the superintendent in recommending selection, assignment, transfer, promotion and dismissal of teachers; also designate salaries in accordance with the schedule and be responsible to the superintendent for "financial matters" and the

¹By-Laws and Regulations of the School Committee of Providence, Rhode Island, pp. 16-18, 1929 (Revised 1938).

²Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the Sacramento, California, Public Schools, p. 24, Article IV, sec. 3, March 3, 1941.

preparation of the annual budget.³ The deputy is a member and a secretary of a Conference Bureau. This Conference meets on the first Thursday of each month for the purpose of study; and to formulate school objectives, policies, organization plans and procedures.⁴ The members are: the superintendent, the deputy, assistant superintendents, principals of senior high schools, business manager, principal of the junior college and director of research.

The rules pertaining to the principal imply that the duties of the assistant superintendents are both administrative and supervisory.

While the principal shall take administrative direction from the Deputy Superintendent, it shall be his responsibility to seek advice and make intelligent use of the leadership of the Assistant Superintendent.⁵

In another part of the same section of the rule the principal is required to advise with the deputy superintendent and with the appropriate assistant superintendent concerning transfer, promotion or dismissal of teacher.⁶

The rules specify that assistant superintendents shall have responsibility for supervision of instruction, counseling, the curriculum, supervision of instruction, and the improvement of teaching in their respective schools. They are responsible for supervising and training of cadet teachers; making use of classroom tests with view of improving them, and generally directing the supervision of special subjects. The administrative duties of assistant superintendents pertain to the compilation of the instructional budget; the holding of meetings regarding administrative problems; and concern for school services to the community.⁷

St. Louis.--In St. Louis the school board publishes an official organ called the Public School Messenger, which is the official publication of the Department of Instruction. The February issue of 1941 is devoted exclusively to the Regulations of the Department of Instruction. The duties of assistant superintendents are specified as follows:

³Ibid., p. 25.

⁴Ibid., p. 28.

⁵Ibid., p. 31.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 32.

The Assistant Superintendents shall aid the Superintendent in performing the work devolving upon him by the rules and regulations of the Board. They shall occupy their whole time, during the sessions of the schools, in visiting the various departments of the same, except when required by the Superintendent to assist him in the performance of other duties. They shall report to the Superintendent weekly and oftener, stating what schools they have visited, and what day and between what hours, giving details of their observations in the schools, and recommending such measures as they deem conducive to the interests of the same.¹

Springfield, Massachusetts.--The rules with regard to duties of the intermediary officers in Springfield, Massachusetts, are exceedingly brief. Article 8 provides that an assistant superintendent shall be designated to act as the superintendent during the superintendent's absence.² The other duties are delegated to the assistants by the superintendent. These are not included in the board rules. The superintendent reported on October 5, 1945 that assistants have charge of administrative and supervisory duties over the entire system.

Wilmington.--The Wilmington, Delaware, school board requires that the assistant superintendents shall be the executive representative of the superintendent.³ This duty involves management of the schools with respect to transfer, promotion, and classification of pupils,⁴ and in the promotion of good instruction, discipline and "other administrative and supervisory duties."⁵ These intermediary officers have functions pertaining to the instructional staff. Sections 12 to 15 of the rules specify:

They shall interview applicants for teaching positions and submit to the Superintendent their estimates. They shall also recommend to the Superintendent transfers and dismissals of teachers and principals. They shall also recommend a list of qualified persons to serve as substitute teachers.⁶

¹Rules and Regulations of the Department of Instruction of the City of St. Louis, p. 56, Rule 8, sec. 16. St. Louis: Public School Messenger, February 1, 1934.

²Rules and Regulations of the School Committee of Springfield, Massachusetts, p. 12, Article 8, 1941.

³Rules of the Board of Public Education in Wilmington, Delaware, pp. 6-8, Article III, secs. 9-23, 1937.

⁴Ibid., sec. 17-18.

⁵Ibid., sec. 9.

⁶Ibid., secs. 12-15.

The assistant superintendents are also responsible for the organization, administration and supervision of summer schools;⁷ the preliminary preparation of the budget; textbook and supplies accounting; and "such other duties as the superintendent may assign to them."⁸

Washington, D. C.--Several types of intermediary officers are employed in the schools of Washington. The rules refer to White First Assistant and the Colored Assistant Superintendent.⁹ The White First Assistant according to Section 7 shall be officially subordinate in rank only to the Superintendent of Schools.¹⁰ For the purpose of clarification, the white intermediary officers have charge of schools to which only white children attend; the colored intermediary officers have equivalent duties over schools to which only Negro children attend. Each of these first assistant superintendents is the Superintendent's Chief Deputy in that division of the school system.¹¹ The white first assistant acts in the absence of the superintendent;¹² he also has charge of elementary schools with respect to supervision and administration in Divisions I to IX. He is held responsible for the progressive development of education in Divisions I to IX of the school system, in accordance with the most approved principles of organization, administration, supervision, and instruction.¹³ The colored first assistant has the same rank in every respect as the white first assistant. He, too, is officially subordinate in rank only to the superintendent of schools; he is superior in rank to every other administrative and supervisory officers in Divisions X to XIII.¹⁴ He has administrative and supervisory powers and duties in senior, junior and vocational high schools, the teachers college, and the supervisory work of department heads, and directors of special subjects. The Miner Teachers College in Divisions X to XIII is under his control. As the superintendent's

⁷Ibid., sec. 21.

⁸Ibid., sec. 23.

⁹Rules and Regulations of Washington, D. C., City Schools, chap. 111, sec. 2, 1943.

¹⁰Ibid., sec. 2, par. 7.

¹¹Ibid., sec. 3, par. 1.

¹²Ibid., sec. 2, par. 2.

¹³Ibid., sec. 2, par. 6.

¹⁴Ibid., sec. 3, par. 8.

chief deputy, he is also responsible for the progressive development of education in his division. The duties regarding this phase of his responsibilities are exactly the same as those of the white first assistant.¹⁵

Associate superintendents in Washington, D. C., are also divided on color lines. The white have charge of Divisions I to IX, and the colored of Divisions X to XIII. One white associate superintendent has charge of Wilson Teachers College, senior high schools, and under direction of the first assistant has general direction of administration and supervision of employees of this division.¹⁶ He is charged with the supervision of the work of heads of departments, the direction of special subjects; and the control of administration in Divisions I to IX.¹⁷ The other white associate superintendent has charge of junior high and vocational schools. He is expected to exercise leadership in the improvement of supervision and administration of these schools of Divisions I to IX.¹⁸ One colored associate superintendent is charged with the administrative and supervisory activities of the elementary schools in Divisions X to XIII.¹⁹ He is to direct the work of all employees in these schools. His rank is equal to that of other associate superintendents.²⁰ The rules carefully define the seniority positions of the intermediary officers. All ranks are equal in importance and salary schedules.

The colored associate superintendent has supervisory and administrative duties over the elementary schools in Divisions X to XIII and other duties equivalent to the white associate superintendent.²¹

The associate superintendent in charge of the school budget is under direct supervision of the superintendent.²² He is required to prepare the budget; secure information incident to the budget; evaluate budget items and estimates; study school needs and the most economical and desirable methods of satisfying these needs; and introduce and operate the most approved principles

¹⁵Ibid., sec. 3, par. 7

¹⁶Ibid., sec. 6, par. 1-2.

¹⁷Ibid., sec. 6, par. 3-7.

¹⁸Ibid., sec. 7, par. 2-7.

¹⁹Ibid., sec. 8, par. 2.

²⁰Ibid., par. 5.

²¹Ibid., sec. 8, par. 1-5.

²²Ibid., sec. 9, par. 1-9.

of public school administration relative to the budget.²³ He is directly responsible to the superintendent of schools in his functions as a budget officer.²⁴

These intermediary officers were known as supervisory principals up to April 7, 1943. From this date, these officers were designated as divisional directors. They are responsible for the organization, management, and supervision of elementary schools in their respective divisions. They have full authority over all employees, classes and schools in the elementary departments of their respective divisions. Each is responsible for supervision of classes and inservice training of teachers and the progressive development of the schools in his area. The classification of pupils and the assignment of pupils and teachers to the various grades are other duties assigned to the Divisional Directors.²⁵

The first assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs is the superintendent's chief deputy in that field and is responsible for the general direction and supervision of the financial transactions, property accounting and responsibility for the custodial staff and other matters pertaining to the business management of the school system. This officer is also responsible for the supervision of maintenance, construction and repairs of school buildings; and for all purchases of equipment, books and supplies. This intermediary officer in the schools of Washington, D. C., is required to introduce and maintain progressive functions of business administration.²⁶

Chicago.--The rules with reference to duties of assistant superintendents are not specific in the Chicago schools. There are five assistant superintendents, two in charge of divisions; one in charge of personnel; one who oversees the special schools; and one who has administrative and supervisory duties over the vocational schools. The assistant superintendent in charge of personnel has the administrative and supervisory duties over evening and summer high schools.

The Strayer Survey of 1932 recommended that assistant superintendents should be held responsible for some city wide

²³Ibid., par. 7.

²⁴Ibid., par. 9

²⁵Ibid., sec. 10, par. 1-8.

²⁶Ibid., sec. 4, par. 1.

division of the school system.¹ The assistant superintendent in charge of vocational schools is responsible for organization, management, and supervision of the vocational schools and the curriculum.² In this he is assisted by several field supervisors. The assistant superintendent in charge of the elementary division interprets the superintendent's policies through nine district superintendents. The high school assistant superintendent has five district superintendents through whom he interprets the superintendent's educational policies.³

There are fourteen district superintendents, five for the high school division and nine for the elementary. The duties assigned to these intermediary officers are supervisory and administrative in nature and scope.

In the elementary division each district superintendent has approximately thirty-five schools. When the office was established in 1898,⁴ the district superintendents were assigned to supervision, but they found little time for supervision, being engaged to a large extent with petty administrative duties. The duties of the elementary district superintendents had not been changed up to 1945. These intermediary officers hold a line position between the assistant superintendents and the principals. They are responsible for the interpretation of the superintendent's educational program. The duties specified are that they bring about desirable coordination of the whole system, promote professional growth of teachers and principal, and administer the schools in a progressive manner.⁵ The five high school district superintendents have substantially the same duties.

¹George D. Strayer, Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago, Illinois, p. 19, Vol. I. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, 1932.

²Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Chicago, Illinois, p. 9, 1940-1941.

³Ibid., p. 9.

⁴Official Report of the Proceedings of the Chicago, Illinois, Board of Education, op. cit., p. 310, October 31, 1898.

⁵Official Proceedings of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, Illinois, p. 40, July 22, 1926.

It is apparent that the need for high school district superintendents was based primarily on supervisory aspects, but subsequently these duties were superseded by a multiplicity of delegated administrative functions. The influence of these intermediary officers on the progressive improvement of teaching and learning is more fully discussed in another part of this chapter.

San Francisco.--In 1944 the board of education of San Francisco adopted the recommendation of the Hill Survey pertaining to the duties of intermediary officers. It assigned one associate superintendent to all instructional affairs, one to all non-instructional affairs; one assistant superintendent to have charge of elementary schools; and one to have charge of secondary schools. The latter two are responsible to the associate superintendent in charge of instruction.¹

The business management of the San Francisco schools is placed under an associate superintendent.

The associate superintendent of instruction directs all staff services, but he is directly responsible to the superintendent for supervision and administration of all instructional activities. Through this arrangement it is thought that all personnel engaged in staff services will have definite knowledge both of their authority and their responsibility.²

Detroit.--The Detroit school system has thirteen intermediary officers. The office of the deputy superintendent was established in 1920 in an attempt to relieve the superintendent of the many administrative responsibilities which were increasing as a result of the growth of the schools. In an annual report for 1921 the duties of the deputy superintendent were defined by the Detroit Board of Education: "The Deputy Superintendent administers directly the elementary platoon schools, intermediate schools, high schools, high school auditor, continuation classes and the vocational bureau."³

¹Official Proceedings of the Board of Education of the City of San Francisco, California, p. 39, 1944.

²Ibid., p. 37.

³Seventy-eighth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Detroit, Michigan, for the School Year Ending June 30, 1921, pp. 61-63.

In more recent years the responsibilities of the deputy superintendent have been more clearly defined and centered upon a particular aspect of city school administration. At present the deputy superintendent is executive vice president of Wayne University. The Dean of the Division of Instruction and all the supervisors of instruction are under the deputy superintendent.¹

The assistant superintendents, four in number, have their duties divided as follows:

One is in charge of finance and general administration, but is not the business manager; his relations with the school principals are not directly concerned with instructional affairs. The second assistant superintendent is responsible for the general control over intermediate and high schools under the deputy superintendent. The third assistant superintendents is in charge of the administration and supervision of technical and vocational schools. The fourth assistant has charge of all elementary schools.

The office of supervising principals in the Detroit schools was established in 1920.² The eight supervising principals supervise a number of elementary schools without being detached from their own elementary schools. Their duties are to visit schools and advise the principals; to supervise the program of instruction; to conduct research and experimental study for the purpose of advancing progressive methods of teaching; to help the principal to initiate an inservice program; and to inspect and report on the physical conditions of the building, textbooks and other equipment. It is apparent, then, that these duties are in a large measure supervisory, though the administrative aspect of their duties is also apparent.

Philadelphia.--Eleven intermediary officers, foud associate superintendents and seven district superintendents, are utilized in Philadelphia. With respect to duties of associate superintendents, Reavis found that some confusion exists regarding professional relations of the principal and the associate

¹Directory of Detroit, Michigan, School System, 1936-1937.

²Seventy-seventh Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Detroit, Michigan, p. 34, 1920.

superintendent.¹ This is obviously due to the fact that the associate superintendents have both departmental and functional responsibilities. These relations are both direct and indirect. The entire administrative set up of line relationship in administration "makes for confusion, delay and irritation."²

Specifically, one associate superintendent is in charge of secondary schools. He is responsible for the development of progressive administration and supervision of high schools. Another associate is held accountable for duties incident to special functions, such as the administration of the budget, approval of requisitions for special equipment and supplies, and the organization of special classes. The elementary schools are under one associate superintendent to whom the seven district superintendents are directly responsible for the efficient administration and supervision of the elementary schools. In theory these duties are apparent, but in practice, the district superintendents had failed (in 1937) to discover the true locus of their responsibilities to the principal and the associate superintendent. The fourth associate superintendent has administrative duties as the superintendent assigns them to him. In case of the superintendent's absence, the fourth associate assumes the duties of the superintendent. His functions are more administrative than supervisory in nature and scope.³

The district superintendents each have one seventh of all the elementary schools assigned to them for the purpose of improving instruction; visiting schools and advising the principals in the administrative problems of schools in their districts; and making periodical reports to the associate superintendent regarding conditions and needs of schools in their districts. Each of these officials is virtually the superintendent over a city unit.

Los Angeles.--The chief assistant superintendent and assistant superintendents are expected to perform such duties as may be assigned to them by the superintendent of schools in Los Angeles. The chief assistant is designated to exercise the duties

¹William C. Reavis, Relations of the School Principal to the Central Office, op. cit., p. 190.

²Ibid., p. 191.

³William C. Reavis, Relations of the School Principal to the Central Office, op. cit., p. 191.

of the superintendent of schools when the latter is absent or is unable to perform duties assigned to him.⁴

The assistant superintendents are responsible to the superintendent and serve in the capacity of assistant general managers. They carry out the responsibility of coordination of the work of the various departments. They are in direct charge of instruction at all levels. The final administrative (other than the superintendent's) authorization in each division and area of instruction rests with the assistant superintendent.⁵

The associate assistant superintendents in reality are district superintendents, each with a number of schools to administer and supervise. They are intermediary officers between the assistant superintendent and the principals. This relationship is observed in the transactions of all matters pertaining to ordinary school business of administration and supervision. Each is "charged with visiting schools as often as practicable for the purpose of obtaining information regarding the general conditions of the school." He is expected to observe carefully the methods of teaching and give assistance to principals and teachers for betterment of school conditions.⁶

Newark.--The duties of the three assistant superintendents in Newark are largely functional. One has charge of instruction in all the schools and is responsible for the coordination of instruction. The two other assistants have special assignments, such as special schools, textbooks, budgetary matters, contacts between the non-educational phases of administration and the educational department.⁷

Columbus.--In a questionnaire sent to the superintendents in which duties of the intermediary officers were specifically requested the superintendent of Columbus personally replied and underscored the duties in the following manner:

⁴Ibid.

⁵Survey of the Los Angeles City Schools, op. cit., p. 36,
1934.

⁶Rules and Regulations, op. cit., p. 17, sec. 131, par. XX.

⁷George D. Strayer and N. L. Engelhardt, Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Newark, New Jersey, pp. 14-16. New York: Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1942.

We have three assistant superintendents; one assigned to assist the superintendent in his administrative duties and two to improve instruction in all divisions of the school system. They are also responsible for the budget, inventories, and the selection of teachers. One is definitely assigned to have supervision of the finance bureau and all work incident to this bureau. The third assistant has direct charge of supervision of senior and junior high schools.¹

Denver.--The schools of Denver have four assistant superintendents whose duties are: to assist the superintendent; to have charge of junior, senior and elementary schools, and to be responsible for the progressive administration and supervision of the superintendent's duties when the latter cannot perform his task because of illness or absence from his office. None of these officers visit schools for the purpose of improving the supervision in the school, though from time to time they hold conferences with the principals of the three divisions of instruction. They also have responsibility for the selection of teachers; and accounting for inventories.²

Somerville.--The administrative organization in Somerville provides one assistant superintendent and seven district supervising principals. The assistant superintendent has been delegated duties by the superintendent for administrative functions. He is to visit schools and report on their efficiency; to inform the superintendent on the conditions with respect to inefficient teachers and the principals. He is responsible for the efficient management and supervision of junior high school and he assists the superintendent in general duties of the entire school system.³

The district supervising principals, seven in number, have been assigned to duties in connection with promoting efficient instruction; training the educational personnel in their districts; and selecting and recommending materials of instruction. Their duties are, in large measure, supervising in nature

¹Supplemental Statement of the Superintendent of Schools of Columbus, Ohio, in the Questionnaire of October 5, 1945.

²Rules and By-Laws of Denver, Colorado, Schools, secs. 1-2, 1939.

³Minutes of Somerville, Massachusetts, School Board, p. 2, July and August, 1941.

and scope.¹

Toledo.--The schools of Toledo have one assistant superintendent for the purpose of coordinating educational services; and one assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs exclusively.²

Tulsa.--Three assistant superintendents are employed in Tulsa. Neither of these is assigned to act in the superintendent's place during his absence. Their duties are administrative and supervisory in connection with the junior, senior, and elementary schools. One of these assistants aids the superintendent with the office details.³

Tacoma.--Two assistant superintendents in Tacoma are assigned as follows: One has administrative duties in the central office so that he may relieve the superintendent of some of his administrative details. He acts in the superintendent's place during the latter's absence. The other assistant superintendent makes surveys and reports on the general efficiency of the schools. Neither of the two are held accountable for the supervision of the schools. This function is merely implied, not specified in the rules.⁴

Youngstown.--One assistant superintendent and two district superintendents or directors are employed by the Youngstown school board. The assistant has over-all supervisory and administrative duties delegated to him by the superintendent, while the district directors are concerned with supervisory duties in a large measure. They visit all senior and elementary schools as often as practicable and aid in the promotion of efficient instruction; report on inefficient teachers and advise the assistant on conditions of the schools.⁵

¹School Report of Somerville, Massachusetts, pp. 22-26, 1941.

²Rules and Regulations of Toledo, Ohio, Schools, Part II, p. 13, 1941.

³By-Laws and Rules of Tulsa, Oklahoma, Public Schools, sec. 2, 1940.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Tacoma, Washington, p.

⁵Rules and By-Laws of Youngstown, Ohio, Schools, pp. 3-12, 1942.

Gary.--An assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs and three supervisors with both line and staff functions are the intermediary officers utilized in Gary. Discussion of the duties of the supervisory officers is deferred until the next section of this chapter.

Grand Rapids.--The one assistant superintendent in Grand Rapids assists the superintendent in whatever duties the superintendent may delegate.¹

Houston.--The three assistant superintendents in Houston have prescribed duties as follows: one to assist the superintendent and relieve him of details; one to supervise the educational personnel; and the third to supervise and administer the elementary and senior high schools. None of the three intermediaries are delegated to assume the superintendent's powers and duties during his absence.²

Seattle.--In 1936 the board of education in Seattle decided to reorganize the central administration. The organization was characterized as a combination of "line staff" and "functional" type.³ The functions of the five assistant superintendents were:

One had charge of curriculum and research, to whom all supervisors were responsible, and the child guidance clinic, with a research assistant. One intermediary was assigned to the administrative and supervisory functions of junior, elementary, and special schools. He was in complete charge of the personnel in these divisions and was responsible for administrative activities of an assistant in charge of the kindergarten primary division and special education. The third assistant was responsible for the organization, administration and supervision of senior high schools and vocational and adult education. The fourth assistant was in charge of purchasing, accounts, plant operation, and maintenance. The fifth assistant superintendent was assigned by the superintendent to assist in the administrative details in the

¹Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth Annual Reports of the Board of Education of Grand Rapids, Michigan, pp. 8-9, 1935-1936.

²Annual Report of Public Schools of Independent School District of Houston, Texas, pp. 32-34, 1921-1922; 1922-1923.

³William C. Reavis, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities, op. cit., pp. 283-284.

superintendent's office.⁴

Providence.--A notable contrast is observed in the present organization of the public school system of Providence, Rhode Island, and that of twenty-four years ago as concerns the allocation of responsibility. Previously there existed an intricate multiple system with authority distributed among several independent persons and committees. The Strayer Survey of 1923 pointed out these weaknesses.⁵ The result of this survey brought about a revision of the administrative organization; the single unit system is now in force. Reavis in his study of Providence school administration after the reorganization concludes, "that each officer of the school system knows for what and to whom he is responsible."⁶ The new plan had established direct lines of authority for all line and staff personnel.

The Providence school system has three intermediary officers; one deputy superintendent, and two assistant superintendents. The deputy superintendent is both a line and a staff officer. As a staff officer he has general supervision over special fields and coordinates the work of the directors of these special fields. As a line officer he is in complete charge of plant construction and is held accountable for these functions only to the superintendent of schools. Recently, (in 1944) the duties with reference to plant construction were delegated to the director of business administration. This was necessary when the board provided for only one deputy instead of two as before. The second deputy provided in the rules and regulations in 1929 was discontinued and his duties were assigned to the remaining deputy, who in addition to the above-mentioned duties also acts in the superintendent's place in case of the latter's absence, and assists the superintendent in all administrative and supervisory details.

The assistant superintendents according to the superintendent's statement of October 5, 1945 have the following duties:

⁴Ibid.

⁵George D. Strayer, Report of the Survey of Certain Aspects of the Public School System of Providence, Rhode Island, p. 48, 1923-1924.

⁶William C. Reavis, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities, op. cit., p. 249.

Their line of authority extends to the elementary schools in the case of one who has administrative and supervisory charge of elementary education; and to the senior high schools in the case of the other Assistant Superintendent. Each of these Assistants is responsible for progressive supervision and management of his division with responsibility to the Superintendent through the Deputy.¹

The analysis of duties of the cities in this study reveals that the major part of the time of intermediary officers is devoted to the management of, and assistance in, administrative operation of the schools. This is a deviation from the duties which early intermediary officers were expected to perform. The evidence supports the generalization that the superintendents in the past forty years have tended to delegate more and more administrative duties to their intermediary officers.

Intermediary Officer as a Business Manager

As in the case of the instructional side, the business matters of the school were originally managed by the board of education itself, and, generally speaking, these activities were kept in its hands for some time after it had begun to delegate strictly educational functions to professional executives.² Occasionally,³ the employment of a business manager preceded that of a superintendent, but as a rule the boards were inclined to regard business administration as peculiarly their own.

In the course of time, however, as the communities developed and the social structure became more complicated, the business aspects of education multiplied and grew more intricate. Then the boards came to feel that these affairs were becoming too large to be directly managed. The expansion and complexity of school business required expert, technical knowledge and consumed so much time that it became necessary to assign these activities to various officers selected especially for the purpose. Hence, in time there were but few communities which did not have at least one official giving full time to the performance of business functions. When the school systems were small, the organization

¹Questionnaire Answers of October 5, 1945, City of Providence, Rhode Island, Data entered by Superintendent.

²John Cayce Morrison, The Legal Status of the City School Superintendent, p. 18. Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1922.

³In Philadelphia, Boston, and Cleveland, for example.

was at first very simple. As cities increased in size, the direction of various activities of material nature were continually differentiated until business officials tended to become persona grata in themselves. When the administrative organization became considerably expanded, a regular business manager and other executives generally evolved; in many cases these officials came to feel that their work was quite independent of the education department, and that they were accountable only to the board of education.¹

There are instances, however, where the views of boards of education were advanced enough to lead them to center the administrative power in the superintendent and to make the business executives directly responsible to him. These cities are: Atlanta, Georgia; Denver, Colorado; Gary, Indiana; Richmond, Virginia; St. Paul, Minnesota; San Francisco, California; Toledo, Ohio; Washington, D. C.; and Wichita, Kansas. In these cities there exists the "unit" organization where all functions are vested in one chief executive with the other officers subordinate. In these cities an assistant superintendent is usually delegated the business functions.

The lack of control of school executives over school property is conspicuous. No educational officer participates to any great extent in the purchasing and managing of school expenditures, property, or supplies. To support these statements pertinent data are herein offered.

The Strayer Survey in Providence, Rhode Island, criticized the business operations of schools stating:

When the annual apportionment is made there is no provision made for supplies as a separate item in the budget. The amount of supplies received by each school depends upon the initiative of the principal. When the supplies are slow in arriving some principals make a special trip to the warehouse personally. No limit is placed upon any school in advance.²

The Strayer Survey of the Chicago Schools recommended that the business affairs of the schools be placed in the hands of the chief executive officer of the board of education, the

¹Chicago, for example.

²George D. Strayer, Report of the Survey of Certain Aspects of the Public School System of Providence, Rhode Island, p. 37, 1923-1924.

superintendent. The survey committee recommended a change in the law to provide for an intermediary officer in charge of business management of schools. They stated their policy as follows:

Great business enterprises, comparable in the amount of money expended, if not in the importance of the service rendered, have found it possible and advisable to place the responsibility in the hands of the chief executive officer and to organize an administrative staff under his leadership.¹

The purpose of the schools is to render instructional service, and the business activities exist only to facilitate instruction and to relieve the professional workers of unnecessary routine.

The practice of operating a school system with a number of independent executives tends to give certain positions prominence that belies the purpose for which public schools are established.

A modern school system cannot be efficiently and economically managed unless executive responsibility is centered in one office. This responsibility should be placed with the superintendent.²

If a unified system of educational administration with a single chief executive is accepted, the office of business manager will give way to an assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs.³

This recommendation, needless to say, was not accepted by the board of education in 1932, although at the time this dissertation is submitted a revision of the Otis Law by the General Assembly has taken place in harmony with the survey recommendation.

The canons of educational opinion support the views that an intermediary officer be assigned to the business duties in a school system, and be directly responsible to the superintendent. Deffenbaugh states it in this manner:

It is now generally thought that in those cities in which the business manager is directly responsible to the board and not to the board through the superintendent of schools, a principle of school administration is violated since educational and business problems overlap and intermingle.⁴

There is an apparent trend toward unification of executive responsibilities even in civil government. The President's

¹George D. Strayer and Others, Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago, Illinois, p. 10, Vol. L. New York: Division of Field Studies, Columbia University, 1932.

²Ibid., pp. 33-34.

³Ibid., p. 41.

⁴W. C. Deffenbaugh, Practices and Concepts Relating to City School Boards of Education, pp. 25-26. Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, Vol. I, chap. vii. Washington, D. C.: United States Office of Education, 1938-1940.

Committee on Administrative Management recommended:

. . . . canons of efficiency require the establishment of a responsible and effective chief executive as a center of energy, direction, and administrative management; the systematic organization of all activities in the hands of a qualified personnel under the direction of the chief executive.¹

Educational surveys support the pronouncement with respect to the necessity that an assistant superintendent directly responsible to the superintendent be assigned to the business functions in a school system. Survey by the Pasadena Taxpayers Association² recommended that "the board begin moving toward unit control, whereby all administrative authority is placed in a single head, the Superintendent of Schools."

The Survey by Engelhardt and Strayer³ of the St. Louis schools pointed out "that there is lack of proper relationship between the Secretary-Treasurer's office and that of the Superintendent." This by virtue of the fact that the secretary's office exists as an independent unit separate and distinct from that of the superintendent of schools.

From these educational opinions it is clear that the tendency is to favor an intermediary officer in charge of business affairs in city school systems.

Of the fifty-seven cities considered in this study, nine have full-time assistant superintendents assigned to business duties exclusively. They are: Atlanta, Georgia; Denver, Colorado; Gary, Indiana; Richmond, Virginia; St. Paul, Minnesota; San Francisco, California; Toledo, Ohio; Washington, D. C.; and Wichita, Kansas. This number represents sixteen per cent of all the cities; and two and seven tenths per cent of all the intermediary officers in the fifty-seven cities.

The duties of these intermediary officers in the nine cities are much alike. First, the assistant superintendent is the superintendent's deputy in charge of and immediately responsible for all financial transactions and property accountability. He

¹Administrative Management in the Government of the United States, p. 2. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, January, 1937.

²California Taxpayers Association Survey of Pasadena City Schools, p. 50, 1931.

³George D. Strayer and N. L. Engelhardt, Survey of the Public Schools of St. Louis, Missouri, p. 243, 1939.

represents the school system in the planning and construction of all new school buildings and additions to old buildings. Moreover, he is responsible for proper maintenance of all school buildings and grounds in accordance with the policy of the educational department. For example, in Washington, D. C., "He shall supervise and direct the procurement of all furniture, equipment, books and supplies in accordance with the policies of the educational officers."¹

The office of finance is under the immediate supervision and control of the intermediary officer in charge of business affairs. All accounting is charged to his office, including the approval of all vouchers to cover materials purchased for the school system. It is important to note that this intermediary serves as a direct channel of communication on all matters pertaining to business administration of the school system between custodial employees and the superintendent. All custodial and operational personnel is under his administration and supervision. It is expected that the assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs be alert to progressive aspects of school business supervision and administration.

It is apparent that progressive school systems are moving in the direction of organizing as a unit in order that all material interests may be coordinated and unified in one person who is the assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs. Graves says that, "only in this way can public education be organized on a sound basis."²

The foregoing evidence reveals that administrative officers in the fifty-seven cities in this study perform many kinds of administrative and supervisory duties. In Table 6 these duties are indicated with the frequency in assignment.

The district superintendents and supervisory principals are found in three of the fifty-seven cities. They are essentially field workers who have charge of districts frequently as large as some city school systems. For example, in Chicago, each district

¹Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, chap. iii, sec. 4, paragraph 5, April 7, 1943.

²Frank P. Graves, The Administration of American Education, pp. 391-400. New York: Macmillan Co., 1932.

TABLE 6

ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY DUTIES
OF INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS IN FIFTY-SEVEN CITIES¹

Duties	Frequency in Assignment
To relieve the superintendent of some administrative duties	57
To more effectively coordinate responsibilities	32
To carry on an extensive inservice program.	26
To provide closer supervision of principals	32
To act in the superintendent's place during his absence	36
To supervise special educational personnel.	34
To supervise special service departments.	24
To administer and supervise senior high schools	33
To administer and supervise elementary schools.	33
To visit schools and report on efficiency	35
To supervise vocational schools	29
To report on inefficient teachers	32
To have charge of inventories	25
To have full charge of business affairs only.	9
To check on teachers' credentials	2
To improve educational service	57
To visit schools and advise principals	36
To make educational surveys	27
To have charge of finance bureau	22
To select and recommend materials of instruction.	21

superintendent has on the average approximately twenty-six thousand children in thirty to thirty-five schools. Their duties are a combination of supervision and administration. Table 7 shows a distribution of specific duties performed by these officers in terms of frequencies by the three cities having such intermediary officers.

In the three cities all the district superintendents are assigned to a geographical district having a number of schools. They are generally responsible for the interpretation of the

¹Data Prepared from Questionnaire to Superintendents, October, 1945.

TABLE 7

DUTIES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS
AND SUPERVISING PRINCIPALS IN THREE CITIES¹

Duties	Frequencies in Terms of Cities
To administer and supervise only a number of schools	3
To train educational personnel	3
To examine prospective teachers	1
To help the principal in problems of instruction	3
To conduct research and experimental study	0
To have charge of curriculum	1
To train special supervisors	1
To examine requisitions.	3
To approve transfer of pupils	2
To report on inefficient teachers	3
To have charge of special supervisors	1
To approve requisitions for supplies	1
To interpret the superintendent's program	3
To attend to administrative details	3
To check on teachers' credentials	1

superintendent's educational policies in all their districts. In only one city are these officers concerned with the examination and selection of the teachers. They are assigned in all three cities to help the principal in his supervisory and administrative duties. None of these three cities require that district superintendents carry on research and experimental study in problems incident to instruction. All cities require that district superintendents attend to administrative duties in their districts. These duties include reporting on inefficient teachers in all cities; approving all requisitions for supplies in one city; transferring pupils in two cities; and interpreting the superintendent's program in all the cities. The evidence indicates that most of the duties of district superintendents are on the administrative side and not on the side of strictly supervisory

¹Data from Questionnaire to Superintendents, October, 1945.

activities incident to the improvement of instruction. It is apparent that there are too many administrative duties delegated to these intermediary officers.

Of the fifty-seven cities ten have intermediary officers designated as deputy superintendents. Their duties vary in nature and scope. Table 8 shows the duties specified relative to these officers.

TABLE 8

DUTIES OF DEPUTY, CHIEF DEPUTY, FIRST ASSISTANT
AND CHIEF ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENTS IN TEN CITIES¹

Duties	Frequencies
To supervise a division (elementary or high school). .	7
To act in the Superintendent's absence	8
To have charge of Public Relations	1
To assist the Superintendent	8
To make surveys	5
To assume responsibilities for business matters . . .	2
To perform special delegated duties	10
To attend to personnel problems	1

Methods of Selecting Intermediary Officers

The method of selecting intermediary officers rests largely within the power of the school superintendent. Table 9 shows how these officers are selected and their tenure. Data with respect to tenure were secured from the questionnaire and the Rules and Regulations of the Boards of Education of the fifty-seven cities.

The School Committee of the city of Boston does not require its superintendent to recommend intermediary officers. Any member of the school committee may do so; although, in practice, the superintendent is consulted.

Only twenty-five cities have a definite tenure for intermediary officers. This tenure is set up by state law or in the rules of the board of education. In Newark, N. J., permanent tenure is given to these officers after three years of satisfactory

¹Data from Questionnaire to Superintendents, October, 1945.

TABLE 9

METHODS OF CHOOSING INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS
AND THEIR TENURE STATUS¹

Groups of Cities by Population	No. of Cities in Each Group	Qualify by Exam- ination	Recommended by Supt. Only	Tenure Fixed by Law
Above 1,000,000	5	1	5	3
500,000 to 1,000,000	9	0	8	5
250,000 to 500,000	17	0	17	10
100,000 to 250,000	26	0	26	7
Totals	57	1	56	25

service. In Los Angeles the tenure period is four years; in Boston six years; in Atlanta, Georgia, four years; and in Buffalo six years. In these cities, the intermediary officers are re-elected or not after the tenure period. Of significance is the fact that no city, except New York, requires that intermediary officers qualify by examination. In Washington, D. C., however, candidates for this position fill out an extensive applications and attach credentials. No examination is prescribed for intermediary officers in Washington. The application is merely an additional source of information for the superintendent.

Thirty-two cities do not specify tenure; the intermediary officers in these cities serve at the pleasure of the superintendent.

Professional Preparation of Intermediary Officers
for Duties Assigned

When the importance and the difficulty of the work of an intermediary officer is considered, it can be justly argued that he should possess certain minimum educational qualifications. Reeder states that, "both graduate and undergraduate programs

¹Data from Questionnaire to Superintendents, October, 1945.

should keep in mind cultural as well as professional studied."¹

The person who directs an organization, division or a department, makes it largely what it is. If the administrator is not well qualified, "his organization or department will never realize its potentialities even though all other conditions for such realization are favorable."² A well qualified administrator, on the other hand, will overcome most obstacles and will make his organization or department function to the highest degree of efficiency.

Regarding the qualities of leadership which the school administrator should have Cubberley specifies:

He must learn to lead by reason of his larger knowledge and his contagious enthusiasm, rather than to drive by reason of his superior power.

He must, out of his larger knowledge, see clearly what are the attainable goals of the school system, and how best and how fast to attempt to reach them. From his larger knowledge, too, he must frequently reach up out of the routine of school supervision and executive duties into higher levels of educational statesmanship.³

The "larger knowledge" which Cubberley refers to, implies many personal characteristics and certainly includes "experiential background." Of course, the amount of formal professional training which is evidenced by a college degree is implied. Table 10 indicates the status of intermediary officers in the fifty-seven cities with respect to degrees held.

Inasmuch as New York City with forty-two and San Francisco with five intermediary officers failed to report the data requested, there are 206 intermediary officers in Table 10. Chicago reports only eighteen intermediary officers, since there is a vacancy in the district superintendency of High School District Number Three.

Careful analysis of Table 10 reveals that the majority of the intermediary officers hold the Master's Degree in Education, 129 out of 206, or 60.2 per cent. Two have no degrees, one in Chicago and one in Kansas City; thirty-four have the Bachelor's

¹Ward G. Reeder, Fundamentals of Public School Administration, pp. 24-25. Chicago: Macmillan Co., 1941.

²Ibid.

³Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public School Administration, pp. 138-139. Chicago: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916.

TABLE 10
DEGREES HELD BY INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS
IN FIFTY-SEVEN CITIES¹

Groups of Cities by Population	No. of Cities in Each Group	No Degree	Bach. Degree Only	M.A.	M.E.	D. Ed.	Ph. D.	Total
Above 1,000,000	5	1	8	33			12	54
500,000 to 1,000,000	9		10	24		1	11	46
250,000 to 500,000	17	1	5	36		1	8	51
100,000 to 250,000	26		11	36		2	6	55
Totals	57	2	34	129	0	4	37	206

Degree only, or 16.4 per cent. A very gratifying indication is the fact that thirty-seven intermediary officers have the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. This is 18.3 per cent, or nearly one fifth of the entire number. Four hold the degree of Doctor of Education.

Apparently the intermediary officers in the fifty-seven cities are very well prepared, if degrees are indicative of professional qualifications. It is evident that superintendents in their nominations of intermediary officers stress professional preparation.

Compensation of Intermediary Officers
in Fifty-Seven Cities

While the cost of the administrative program is by no means the exclusive criterion of the validity and effectiveness of the administrative services, it is nevertheless, an important consideration. Henry points out that: "Any analysis with regard to cost must bear relationship to specific services which account

¹Data from Questionnaire Answers by the Superintendents of Fifty-Seven City School Systems, October, 1945.

for the expense in question."¹ It is a reasonable presumption that the administrative program may be expected to justify appropriations provided for its support because it not only controls and directs all other services involved in operating the schools but "also measurably influences the allocation of funds to the support of other necessary services."² In good grace, then, the administrative staff must face the question of cost in relation to its own organization and services.

Table 11 indicates the relative salaries of intermediate officers in cities of 100,000 or more in population reporting cost data. This cost is shown by population groups.

TABLE 11

SALARIES PAID TO THE INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS
IN FIFTY-THREE CITIES IN THE YEAR 1944 - 1945³

Groups of Cities by Population	No. of Cities	No. of Intermediary Officers	Range of Salaries		Total Cost in Each Group
			Lowest	Highest	
Above 1,000,000	5	98	\$3,660	\$12,500	\$ 839,708
500,000 to 1,000,000	9	51	4,000	8,120	317,702
250,000 to 500,000	16	46	3,000	10,000	272,189
100,000 to 250,000	23	46	3,400	8,000	248,818
Totals	53	241	Average \$6,964.04		\$1,678,417

Only four of the fifty-seven cities did not report the salaries of their intermediary officers. The data presented account for 241 intermediary officers in fifty-three cities.

The salaries range from \$3,000 to \$12,500 in the fifty-

¹Nelson B. Henry, Cost Analysis as a Means of Evaluating the Administrative Program, pp. 107-109. An address found in the Proceedings of the Ninth Conference for Administrative Officers of Public and Private Schools, Vol. III. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

²Ibid.

³Special Bulletin on Salaries, Tabulations 1B, pp. 1-2. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, May, 1945.

three cities represented in the table.

The highest total cost for the salaries paid intermediary officers is represented in the group of cities of one million or over in population--the expenditure being \$839,708.

The lowest total cost for the salaries paid intermediary officers is found in the group of cities of one hundred thousand to two hundred and fifty thousand in population. Here the total salary of intermediary officers is \$248,818.

The average salary of intermediary officer in the fifty-three cities is \$6,964.04.

Summary

The primary function of a city school system is to develop and implement an efficient program of instruction. To do this, it is necessary to organize the teaching and administrative personnel so that their service reaches every child in the system. The duties performed by the personnel are, therefore, of paramount importance. Teachers ought to be properly trained before they are employed, but this was not possible during the period when city schools were in the process of rapid development. It was thus essential for administrative officers in city schools to set up a program of inservice improvement for staff members (principals and teachers) whose professional training was inadequate. Since the superintendents in rapidly growing systems had many demands made on their time, they found it necessary to supplement themselves with assistants who could assume some of the duties of leadership. Since the instructional program presented the most serious problem at the time, it was natural that assistants be selected to undertake responsibilities in connection with supervision and the improvement of instruction.

The first assistants to be recommended by the superintendent for appointment were officials to function between the superintendent and the principals, who in general were unable to provide the training services for teachers which were required. The boards of education readily approved the recommendations of their superintendents in some of the large school systems and approved the appointment.

At first these officers devoted practically their full time to the program of instructional improvement. They, with the

cooperation of principals and teachers, graded the course of study; trained teachers in methods of teaching the newly introduced subjects; selected and helped to organize materials of instruction; studied and introduced techniques of teaching suitable for effective learning; visited schools and helped principals in organizing inservice training programs; and held numerous conferences with teachers for the purpose of common discussion of teaching and learning problems. The functions of the early intermediary officers were supervisory. However, as the school systems rapidly expanded not only in area but in curriculum offerings, these officers had other duties assigned to them. After 1890 the duties of intermediary officers were in a state of transition from strictly supervisory activities to a combination of administrative and supervisory activities.

There were many factors which were responsible for this transition. The designation of the superintendent as an executive officer of the board of education necessitated the delegation of some of the superintendent's administrative duties to the intermediary officers and with the introduction of teachers of special subjects and special subject advisers the intermediary officers were able to dispense with some of their previous assignments. Furthermore, the development of the principal as the administrative and supervisory head of the school, the division of city schools into geographical districts, and finally the organization of the schools in city systems along departmental lines, necessitated the assignment of intermediary assistants to duties pertaining to personnel, budgets, building construction, and supervision in the district or areas established. For example, the assistant superintendents in some cities were delegated to have charge of personnel problems, issue permits for use of school buildings, recruit substitutes, supervise school funds, and requisition and make recommendations to the superintendent and the business department. Assistants were frequently asked to take charge of the administration of board policies. On the other hand, some assistant, deputy, and associate superintendents had charge of senior or elementary divisions with all responsibilities of administration and supervision pertaining to the assignment of teachers, allotment of funds from the budget, pupil accounting, and the program of instruction. Some confusion at the beginning regarding the responsibilities of intermediary officer was

inevitable. There were duplications of functions and lack of coordination. The superintendents took cognizance of this situation and recommended to their boards rules which specifically defined the duties of their assistants. This was necessary to improve the relationship between the intermediary officers themselves and the principals.

In several cities the superintendent became the chief executive officer of the schools and by virtue of this title acquired additional responsibilities, among them, the responsibility for the business affairs of the schools. In all such cases the superintendent assigned an assistant superintendent to have charge of business affairs and to be responsible to him (the superintendent) for financial transactions and property accounting. He represented the superintendent in school building planning and construction. He was made responsible for proper maintenance of school buildings and grounds and the employment of janitors, custodians and other help needed to operate the buildings. School finance was placed under the immediate supervision and control of the intermediary officer in charge of business affairs. All procurement of furniture, books, and supplies were supervised by this officer. The approval of vouchers to cover purchases and accounts was also a responsibility of his office. It was at once evident that the superintendent could not perform these specialized duties without the services of assistants with special competence. In taking on new responsibilities the intermediary officer frequently found need for further preparation. The superintendent also had to devise better ways of choosing his assistant. Qualifications and standards of selection had to be improved in order that the intermediary officers would be better prepared to meet the complexities of the new duties. It was expected that they would secure a broader knowledge and would develop educational leadership in the areas of service assigned to them.

Intermediary officers in city schools are gradually acquiring the professional preparation which their responsibilities demand. The superintendents and boards of education have taken cognizance of the fact and have provided appropriate compensation for the services rendered.

CHAPTER IV

POWERS AND DUTIES OF INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS RECOMMENDED IN SCHOOL SURVEY

Introduction

The powers and duties assigned to intermediary officers have been evaluated by survey staffs which have conducted surveys of city school systems. Twenty-two of the fifty-seven large cities studied in this investigation have had surveys some two or more times within the last thirty-five years. For the most part, these cities are in the population group 500,000 to 1,000,000 and over. These surveys, because of the high professional standing of the staffs and the impartial methods employed, have tended to establish standards in administration of great importance. Furthermore the survey reports have probably become the most authoritative literature in the field of educational administration.

In this chapter the findings and recommendations of the survey commissions regarding the powers and duties of intermediary officers are analyzed as a basis for evaluating the practices of city systems in assigning duties to their intermediary functionaries. Four classes of intermediary officers are considered, namely, (1) deputy, chief deputy, first assistant, and associate superintendents; (2) associate assistant, and associate assistant superintendent; (3) district superintendents; and (4) supervising principals.

Deputy, Chief Deputy, First Assistant and Chief Associate Superintendent

The surveys generally approve the appointment of a type of intermediary officer who stands next in line to the superintendent. In the large cities this type of officer is also strongly recommended. Preference is not expressed regarding the title of the position, since the duties assigned are much the same regardless of the title used. The chief purpose of the

position is to relieve the superintendent of many of the details of administration. The survey findings generally show that the chief executive in a large school system must have assistance both in the area of business administration and in instruction. The responsibility of this functionary would be chiefly of an administrative character in the execution of adopted policies, although, he would be expected to participate with the superintendent in the formulation of policies. In the absence of the superintendent from the city, the deputy, chief deputy, first assistant, or chief associate would act for the superintendent.

The need for such an officer in cities of medium size as well as in large cities is apparent if the superintendent is to find the time to devote his energies to the important problems of policy making and educational leadership. The practices found in the cities studied and the recommendations made by survey commissions with respect to this particular officer are considered in this chapter.

Associate, Assistant, and Associate- Assistant Superintendents

There are, in the fifty-seven cities in this study, 186 intermediary officers who are variously known as Associate, Assistant, and Associate-Assistant Superintendents. They comprise the largest group of the entire number (253) of intermediary officers in the fifty-seven cities. At least one of the three classifications is found in every city, and in some, two or all three as in New York for example.

The early origin and development of this group of intermediary officers rest chiefly on the need to improve instruction. However, survey studies reveal that the duties of these officers have deviated from the original purposes for which they were appointed.

In the judgment of survey commissions most city school systems could greatly improve their administrative practices by analyzing and reassigning the duties of these officers. Under the present set up of duties, the assistant or associate superintendents are likely to exert a minor influence on instruction because of an extremely wide diversity of duties.

The survey studies, therefore, recommend that these officers be assigned to functional duties such as: administration,

instruction and curriculum, business affairs of the school, and personnel. They should give full time to the specialized areas assigned and not undertake to function as general assistants. The result of these recommendations are that the school systems in ten cities (up to October, 1945) have assigned assistant or associate superintendents exclusive to duties pertaining to business affairs.

In general the surveys recommend: (1) a broader clarification of duties for these officers; (2) a definite division and coordination of duties and responsibilities; and (3) a policy with respect to the assignment of duties on the basis of special functions.

District Superintendents

District Superintendents have been established in three cities with population of one million or over.

The survey commissions in their findings in Chicago and Philadelphia stated that district superintendents occupy a position of great potential leadership but are so limited by needless handicaps, including many clerical and administrative duties, that only the most aggressive and imaginative officers save themselves from becoming merely routine overseers in a well organized and smooth running system.

The district superintendents derive whatever authority they have from their immediate superiors, the associate or assistant superintendents. Their authority over the schools in their own districts is further limited by directors who in many respects are coordinate in authority with associate or assistant superintendents to whose offices in other respects they are subordinate. In some situations these directors have authority at least coordinate with that of the district superintendent. The net result of these overlapping areas of higher authorities over the elementary schools is that the district superintendents have little original jurisdiction over the great responsibilities that devolve of necessity upon them as heads of districts. The district superintendents, therefore, become in effect the field agents of the central office. They have little to say as to the course of study, assignment or transfer of regular or substitute teachers.

Any changes to be made in the internal organization of schools in prevailing instructional procedures, or in the

distribution and use of instructional materials, must come from the central office and be city-wide in scope unless definitely intended as an experimental try-out in a few schools selected for the purpose. Thus, much of the district superintendent's functioning is in conformity with traditional practice that assumes the sole right of initiative and of judgment to emanate from the office of the assistant superintendents. In many matters these officers do not enjoy the freedom in the interpretation of policies that would provide for the desirable amount of administrative independence. In the same spirit they operate to a large extent as the transmitters of information from the central administrative authorities to the building principals. The survey staffs found no evidence in Chicago or Philadelphia that there is any tendency to depart from a practice that existed before most of the present district superintendents attained their position. Herein lies one of the serious weaknesses in the position of district superintendents. Left to their own devices, it is conceivable that they would formulate policies consistent with the particular needs of the community in which they serve. Such an opportunity would provide for progressive leadership and the development of new ideas and policies of distinctive merit. Despite their somewhat imposing title and the extensive scope of teacher and pupil personnel subject to their jurisdiction, their functioning operates within exceedingly narrow limits. As things stand district superintendents exercise little influence on the program of instruction in the schools under their control.

The survey recommendations pertaining to district superintendents state that the general policy toward these officers should be revised.

Supervising Principals

The office of Supervisory Principal has developed out of a need to help building principals in their many administrative and supervisory programs especially during periods of rapid growth in cities. Only two city systems now have supervisory principalships, Washington, D. C., which has nine such officers, and Somerville, Massachusetts, which has seven.

The supervisory principal up to 1930 in Washington was also a building principal. He devoted some of his time to the schools in the area of his school. At first his chief concern

was the program of instruction, later he had to report on building needs, personnel budget, and janitorial services. Thus, his duties were both administrative and supervisory. In October, 1945, the supervisory principal in Washington, D. C., was similar in rank to district superintendent in other cities but with no building to supervise. Instead, he was assigned to an area which contained several schools. In Somerville, the supervising principal devotes some time to his own school and the rest of his time to the supervision of the several schools in the area of his responsibility.

Findings and Recommendations of Surveys and Studies

Studies by survey staffs of the cities in this investigation reveal the following opinions with respect to the influence of district superintendent's instruction. In Chicago, for example, it was found:

That effective supervision is too rarely found in the elementary schools. If a sound program of supervision were to be effective under the present organization of the schools, it would have to come down to the individual schools through the office of district superintendent. The exigencies of the present organization make these officials administrators above all things. Under the present plan these officials are held responsible in their districts for practically all of the duties and responsibilities of the superintendent of schools in a smaller city. It is beyond reason to expect them to be effective supervisors when they are so burdened with the detail of administrative duties.¹

The instructional activities of the district superintendents are handicapped by too many duties. The great difficulty which these officials face in finding time for educational leadership is their heavy burden of administrative responsibility.²

The survey commission found in 1932 that the assistant superintendents in Chicago schools performed too many diversified duties throughout the school system. They should instead be held responsible for some city-wide division of the school system as in the case of an assistant superintendent in charge of senior

¹George D. Strayer and Others, Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago, Illinois, pp. 136-137, Vol. III. New York: Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.

²Ibid., p. 138.

high schools, the commission stated.¹

It is recommended, therefore, that one assistant superintendent be assigned to each of the following divisions: elementary education, secondary, and higher education, special schools and special classes, personnel, and business affairs.

If these assignments are made then each of these assistant superintendents should have two district superintendents assigned with the exception of the assistant superintendent in charge of special classes who should have one district superintendent assigned for classes for the backward, the blind, the crippled, the speech defective and the truant. The district superintendent should devote his time to these special classes, while the assistant superintendent should assume primary responsibility for evening schools, prevocational, summer, continuation schools and community centers.²

The business office should be placed in charge of an assistant superintendent. He will have to deal with the problems which are now placed in charge of the business manager.³

The survey commission stated that a school system the size of Chicago should provide the superintendent with a deputy who should be expected to accept any responsibility which may be delegated to him as the representative of the chief executive officer. The deputy superintendent should not be thought of as an assistant superintendent charged with responsibility for some particular division, but as one who may from time to time be given any assignment by his chief which is in line with the responsibility of the superintendent in carrying out the policies adopted by the board of education.

This officer, according to the survey report, will make it possible for the superintendent to give his time and thought to the major problems of administration while assigning to his deputy responsibilities for coordinating the activities of other intermediary officers.⁴

Up to October 1945, none of these recommendations was put into practice except that an assistant superintendent was appointed for personnel.

¹Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago, Illinois, op. cit., pp. 17-23, Vol. I.

²Ibid., p. 20.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

The School Survey Commission of Pittsburgh in 1929 evaluated the services of associate superintendents as follows:

The work has not only been ably and wisely carried on, but, in the judgment of the Commission, the very spirit and manner in which it has been done has happily served to stimulate the whole teaching force to higher professional endeavor, and a finer appreciation of the human elements involved in the teacher's work.¹

The same commission was so impressed with the professional contributions of the associate and the first associate superintendent that it recommended to the board an additional associate to have charge of the personnel in the schools.

The Associate Superintendent in Charge of Personnel was appointed and now carries full responsibility for all professional personnel as well as for secretarial staff and for certain other clerical workers. He has no responsibility for the large majority of the non-professional personnel employed by the secretary, the Superintendent of Buildings, and the Superintendent of Supplies.

The later survey of the Pittsburgh schools in 1940 strongly recommended the establishment of the office of Deputy Superintendent. The survey staff pointed out that in any large city system it is essential that the superintendent be relieved of the great burden of detail which members of the staff or citizens bring to him. When a deputy superintendent is appointed it should be clearly understood that he acts with full authority of the superintendent in all areas to which he is assigned. He must, as well, be thought of as acting for the superintendent in the latter's absence.

The survey recommended that the Associate Superintendent in Charge of Properties should continue to exercise the functions now discharged by the Superintendent of Buildings.² The Associate Superintendent in Charge of Business Affairs should be titled "Secretary and Associate Superintendent in Charge of Business Affairs," if this seems desirable. It was definitely recommended that he carry forward all of the duties now performed by

¹Special Commission, Survey of the Educational Department of the Pittsburgh Schools, p. 40, chap. ii. Pittsburgh: The Board of Public Education, 1928.

²George D. Strayer, Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Pittsburgh, p. 295. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940.

the Secretary, and that in addition he be given general oversight of and responsibility for the work now carried on by the Assistant of Supplies.³

In the case of the Associate Superintendent in Charge of Personnel it is recommended that he perform the function now attached to his office and that in addition he be given an assistant who might be called the "Director of Non-Professional Personnel."⁴

It was also recommended that the associate superintendency now vacant be filled and that the person selected be given responsibility for many of the administrative problems now carried by the associate superintendents in charge of elementary and high school. He might be called Associate Superintendent in Charge of Administration.⁵ The Associate Superintendent in Charge of Administration should relieve the Superintendent and his Deputy of many problems that are now carried to the chief administrative officer. If he be a man of high competence this officer might also lead in the development of the program of the Parent Teacher Associations, always working in complete cooperation with and through the principals of the several schools. Even more significantly, this Associate Superintendent should be competent to deal with the public in general and with organized group of laymen.⁶

The Associate Superintendents now in charge of elementary and secondary education should be placed in a position which would enable them to devote their entire time to instruction.⁷

Immediately responsible to the Associate Superintendent in Charge of Elementary Education should be placed directors of kindergarten, elementary education, and remedial instruction. In like manner the director of extension education and director of recreation should be made responsible to the Associate Superintendent in Charge of Secondary Education.⁸

These assignments are in general already part of the functions of the Associate Superintendents in Charge of elementary and Secondary Schools.⁹

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 296.

⁵Ibid., p. 297.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 298.

⁸Ibid., p. 299.

⁹Ibid.

In Louisville, Kentucky, the Survey Committee criticized the organization of the central office because of the lack of coordination between the schools and the intermediary officers. The committee recognized "the need for improving relations with schools regarding instruction."¹ The assistant superintendent in charge of supplies and budgetary information was discontinued and was supplemented by an assistant superintendent in charge of instruction and curriculum for the purpose of improving instructional service to the schools by the intermediary officers. This concept was clearly enunciated by the committee as follows:

In securing this coordination it is essential that the Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent for Administration at all times bear in mind that the main function of the latter is to contribute to the securing of conditions and facilities to improve curriculum and instruction.²

The commission was not satisfied with the intermediary officers and the paucity of their professional influence on instruction. It stated:

In general, the work of the central office should be that of encouragement and stimulation to the principal who should in turn be able to take greater responsibility for leadership in his school.³

Thus, the survey findings reveal that the central office should be a stimulating factor in professional leadership bearing particularly on instruction. The statement quoted implies that the central office in Louisville has to some extent failed in this obligation.

In 1937, Reavis made a study of sixteen large city school systems in the United States and two in Canada. This study deals particularly with the relations of school principals with the central office in large cities. In almost all stages in the development of school principalship and the city superintendent, intermediary officers were involved. The fund of concrete data reported makes possible critical examination of current practices in city school administration. For example, in the study of the Philadelphia schools Reavis concluded that "Some confusion exists

¹George A. Works, Survey Report of the Louisville Public Schools, p. 65. Printed by the City of Louisville, Kentucky, 1943.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

with respect to the relations of the principal to the associate superintendents. This is obviously due to the fact that the associate superintendents have both departmental and functional responsibilities. The relations of a principal with the four associate superintendents are thus evidently both direct and indirect."¹

In the case of elementary schools the relationship was more confusing since "they are under the immediate administration of district superintendents who are directly responsible to the associate superintendent in charge of elementary schools and indirectly responsible to other associate superintendents in charge of special functions."² In theory, Reavis stated, "the elementary school principals have no direct relation with the associate superintendents, a conclusion supported by the opinion of all the district superintendents and eighty-seven and seven tenths per cent (87.7%) of all the elementary school principals."³

He further points out that:

Three fourths of the district superintendents and approximately one third of the elementary and junior high school principals regard the associate superintendent as an intermediary executive officer between the principal and the superintendent. The same proportion of district superintendents and about sixty per cent of the elementary and junior high school principals consider that the principal's relations with the associate superintendent may be either direct or indirect, depending on the nature of the matter on which central office advice is required. One fourth of the district superintendents and approximately one sixth of the elementary and junior high schools regard the relation of the principal with the associate superintendents as largely consultative. Two elementary school principals were completely bewildered regarding the relationship, stating that the principal was directly responsible to the associate superintendent only when the associate acted in the absence of the superintendent.⁴

These data indicate that the central office had set up an exceedingly confusing relationship between the superintendent, associate superintendents, and district superintendents and the school principals. Instruction suffers because of the confusion, irritation, and delay. As further proof of this generalization, additional supporting evidence is furnished by Reavis regarding

¹William C. Reavis, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities, op. cit., pp. 190-192.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

the relation of district superintendents and the elementary and junior high school principals.

The relation of the elementary or junior high school principal to the district superintendent is one of direct responsibility, although it is understood that the principal is free to consult the superintendent or an associate superintendent. While eighty per cent (80%) of the principals of elementary and junior high schools so conceive their relationship with the district superintendent, the remaining twenty per cent (20%) indicate more or less confusion. A small number (eighteen or about nine per cent) regard the district superintendent as the sole intermediary executive officer between the school principal and the superintendent. About the same number look upon the district superintendent as a departmental executive with authority over the principal only in departmental matters. A few principals (three) consider that the principal is required to consult the district superintendent only with regard to matters involving modifications in established practices, while four hold that the district superintendent functions chiefly as a central office supervisor and is not an intermediary executive officer between the principal and the superintendent.⁵

The fact that twenty per cent (20%) of the elementary and junior high school principals revealed confusion with respect to official status of the district superintendent indicates great variation in the understanding of the relationship existing between these principals and their district superintendents.

When so large a percentage of principals manifest such wide variation in their understanding of official relations with immediate superior executive officers, doubt is raised with regard to the effectiveness of their working relations. Certainly, the state of confusion does not comport with the working relations expected of school executives so closely related in theory as are the school principals and district superintendents in Philadelphia.⁶

In the schools of Kansas City the principal of each division recognizes the assistant superintendent of both divisions (elementary and high schools) as superior line officers, but in practice these officers function as consultants rather than as superior executives of the principals. The problems connected with the organization and management of the schools, and also the assignment of teachers call for consultations.

The assistant superintendent in charge of elementary schools handles all requisitions for textbooks, maps, and other materials. These duties involve purely administrative service

⁵Ibid., p. 192.

⁶Ibid.

and have little bearing on instruction. The supervision of instruction is left largely to supervisors, directors, and the building principals. The first two are always on call; the principal is held responsible for the use of their services.¹

The assistant superintendents in the schools of Boston take a very active part in supervision for the improvement of instruction.² They may advise the teachers directly, but in practice, they usually consult the principal.

Potentially, the assistant superintendents still possess considerable control over the administration of individual schools. They are not only clothed with authority "to act in matters of organization, instruction, and discipline of each school in their respective districts but are authorized by the rules and regulations of the school committee to exercise, in their discretion, any or all of the duties assigned to directors, supervisors, and principals or teachers."³ As a group, assistant superintendents have a great deal of authority in the introduction and modification of courses of study, selection of textbooks, and certification of teachers.

An exceedingly interesting practice has been developed in Boston; the superintendent rotates the assistant superintendents every four years. This makes them more familiar with all the schools and their principals. Moreover, supervisory functions over the entire system are rotated among the different assistant superintendents. By this means each assistant superintendent is privileged to view the entire system as a whole rather than as a single district or a single segment of the educational program. Reavis in his study appraises the situation very adequately by saying that "the superintendent of schools has been successful in developing a strong professional attitude among the assistant superintendents. The weekly meetings have been especially helpful in this respect."⁴ He concluded that, in general, the intermediary officers in Boston play a prominent role in the improvement of instruction.

Ayres in his survey of the Cleveland schools in 1916 had

¹William C. Reavis, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities, op. cit., p. 120.

²Ibid., p. 25.

³Ibid., p. 24.

⁴Ibid., p. 25.

had this to say about educational leadership in general:

The whole situation as to educational leadership can be improved by replacing some of the least able members of the force, and by stimulating, training and guiding others. There must be built up in the system a type of supervision based on ascertained fact that will reveal conditions and aid in solving problems in the work of instruction throughout the city.¹

In his study of the relations of the school principals to the central office in Cleveland Reavis points out that the intermediary officers are concerned with too many administrative details to give adequate assistance to the instructional program. There exists in the Cleveland schools a period for consultation by the principal with the assistant of a given division. Any departure from the curriculum by a principal, for instance, must be "talked over" with the assistant superintendent. Then, too, in a large program of extra curricular activities the assistant superintendent "must be consulted." It is apparent from the evidence, that the educational leadership of intermediary officers in Cleveland with respect to instruction is impaired because of too many delegated duties which deal with managerial services.

The district superintendents in the Detroit schools have made a notable contribution to the administration of the elementary schools. They have made considerable progress "in evolving a more adequate technique for the administration of their respective districts."² These improvements have resulted in "closer cooperation between principals and supervisors with advantages accruing to all elementary schools."³ Moreover, these officers "facilitate administration of elementary schools by solving problems and making adjustments on the spot."⁴ This practice saves time and makes for consequent better efficiency in instruction.

The deputy superintendent in the Detroit schools has general administrative responsibilities assigned to him. His duties are very broad in scope and deal in a large measure with management.

¹Leonard P. Ayres, The Cleveland Survey Committee of the Cleveland Foundation, pp. 54-55. Cleveland, Ohio: Board of Education, 1917.

²William C. Reavis, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities, pp. 97-102.

³Ibid., p. 98.

⁴Ibid.

His influence on instruction is indirect chiefly through consultation and bulletins to officers of instruction.

The assistant superintendents are "line" officers; one of the four has no direct relations with problems of instruction. He is an administrative officer in charge of finance and "general administration."⁵ The one assistant superintendent assumes general control over each division, intermediate and high schools, and holds periodic conferences with divisional directors and principals on problems which concern instruction. His influence in this respect is indirect.

In San Francisco, only one of the two associate superintendents is directly responsible for instructional affairs. The other associate is in charge of business affairs.

The Survey Commission in August, 1944 made the following recommendation with respect to an associate in charge of instruction.

To the associate superintendent of instruction direct personal responsibility for the coordination of all staff services is assigned. Under the direct personal supervision of the associate superintendent of instruction these several staff services can more readily be focused upon and geared to the needs of the several divisions of the school system.⁶

These recommendations were adopted and put into operation in 1945. As a result one associate superintendent in the San Francisco schools now has direct influence on the program of instruction; the other associate influences instruction only in an indirect manner.

The assistant superintendents are under the supervision of the associate superintendent in charge of instruction. Each is "responsible for the education program; one for the elementary and the other for senior and junior high schools and the junior colleges."⁷ These officers influence instruction through their responsibilities in selecting the instructional staff for their respective divisions. They are authorized "to request the services of specialists, such as supervisors and directors."⁸

⁵Ibid., p. 102.

⁶Clyde M. Hill and Others, Survey of San Francisco Schools, pp. 35-41. Volume on Administrative Organization Study. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1944.

⁷Ibid., p. 39.

⁸Ibid.

The associate superintendent for instruction has charge of the following services which bear a direct relation to instruction: (1) curriculum and guidance, (2) special classes and services to the handicapped pupils, (3) libraries and instructional aids, and (4) research and investigation.⁹

The San Francisco schools have developed an effective program of vocational and adult instruction. An assistant superintendent is in charge of these services. He has two directors with whom he develops, organizes and evaluates the instruction in this division.¹⁰

Since 1944, the instructional services in the San Francisco schools are reported to have been improved because of: (1) better coordination of services, and (2) more effective division of duties and responsibilities. The intermediary officers, one associate superintendent and three assistant superintendents, influence directly the services of instruction through the selection of the staff; through inservice training; through the selection and organization of materials of instruction, and through research and experimental study of instructional problems.

A survey of the St. Louis schools made by Charles H. Judd and others in 1917 revealed that assistant superintendents and supervisors were not effective in their supervisory program. The survey staff recommended that: General supervision needed to be strengthened.¹¹ With regard to assistant superintendents the staff said: "The assistant superintendents are exactly what the designation implies. They are assistants to the superintendent. The survey urges more supervision."¹²

The foregoing statement implies that duties were delegated to the intermediary officers by the superintendent as he found it necessary. There was no definite organization of duties for these officers.

In 1939, the St. Louis school system initiated a self survey in which eighty people participated. This group was designated as the Committee of Eighty. It included six assistant

⁹Ibid., p. 41.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 43.

¹¹Charles H. Judd and Others, Survey of St. Louis Schools, p. 68. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1916.

¹²Ibid., p. 64.

superintendents, six high school principals and assistants, nineteen elementary principals, several college teachers and special supervisors, personnel directors, divisional assistants, and also classroom teachers.¹ The report of this committee issued in 1941 called attention to the fact that:

The principles of good learning and the conditions under which they can best function are now in operation in many schools and classrooms in St. Louis. The problem is one of extending those conditions so that the principles may be increasingly effective in all schools and in all supervisory and administrative relationships.²

The influence of intermediary officers was apparently not consistent. The recommendation implied that intermediary officers do not influence instruction positively, but only in sporadic fashion.³

The influence of intermediary officers in Buffalo, New York, on instruction was appraised by the survey committee as follows:

In the judgment of the survey committee, three of the four intermediary officers, all deputy superintendent, one in charge of elementary schools, one supervises the kindergarten activities, and the third, in charge of secondary schools, are all helping to improve instruction especially through an active program of teacher training centers. Their programs include administrative and supervisory activities and many general professional activities, among them, training of demonstrators for effective teaching.

From about sixty observations there was evidence that earnest serious attempts are made to utilize teachers' resources to the utmost for the profitable instruction of pupils.

Under the leadership of deputy superintendents, Buffalo has aroused the elementary and secondary staffs in a program of curriculum construction and revision in an effective manner.⁴

The survey staff recommended, however, what it thought would improve supervision of instruction by intermediary officers, namely, "by making the administrative organization less rigid and by fitting the organization to personnel."⁵

¹Department of Instruction Committee of Eighty, St. Louis Self Survey, p. 149. Vol. I, Approved Recommendations. St. Louis: Board of Education, September, 1941.

²Ibid., p. 84.

³Ibid., p. 84.

⁴Buffalo Municipal Research Bureau, Report of Buffalo, New York, School Survey, pp. 186-187, chap. II. Buffalo: Board of Education, 1930.

⁵Ibid., p. 32.

According to the survey report of St. Paul, Minnesota, intermediary officers influence instruction directly in a very limited way. One assistant superintendent meets with groups of teachers, principals, supervisors and visiting teachers. She visits principals while at work in the schools.¹ This official, however, has many routine administrative responsibilities, such as transfers, preparation of budget, substitutes, personnel problems and requisitions. The survey committee pointed out that little time is left for visiting schools.

The second assistant superintendent influences instruction only as she interviews prospective teachers and gives advice to new teachers employed and to girls as to what normal schools to attend. That is the extent of duties of this officer with respect to instruction. The survey reveals that this second assistant superintendent devotes considerable time to clerical work, such as mailing records, furnishing the names of tutors, telephoning to the schools announcing meetings, lectures, and demonstrations, scheduling rooms for meetings in courthouse, and answering questions on various subjects--thus, serving virtually as a general information clerk.²

The survey findings further reveal that intermediary officers in St. Paul in so far as their influence on instruction is concerned are ineffective.

In 1935, the United States Office of Education was invited to survey the school system of Cincinnati, Ohio. The findings of this survey committee reveals the following facts with respect to intermediary officers in Cincinnati, Ohio:

The time of the two assistant superintendents in charge of elementary and secondary schools respectively is absorbed largely by administrative duties. They prepare and administer the budgets of their schools, assign personnel, adjust the numerous problems which come to them from principals, teachers, parents, pupils, pass upon requisitions of principals for supplies and equipment, and prepare reports to the superintendent on the status and needs of the schools. Very little time is left for supervision of instruction, and consequently very little is done.

¹N. C. Kearney and Others, Survey of the St. Paul, Minnesota, Public Schools, Vol. I, p. 28. St. Paul: Board of Education, 1928.

²Ibid., pp. 29-30.

It is the judgment of the survey staff that the allocation of duties to the assistant superintendents is fundamentally wrong. The primary function, namely, the direction and supervision of instruction, receives least attention.¹

The survey committee further points out that the assistant superintendents are forced to neglect the improvement of instruction because of their heavy load of administrative duties. They must, therefore, rely largely on indirect methods to achieve the primary result desired.²

As a result of these findings the board of education changed the functions of intermediary officers. In 1944, Cincinnati had one intermediary officer, an assistant superintendent in direct charge of administration who was responsible for routine measures with reference to funds, salaries, requisitions, and the like. He definitely did not have direct responsibilities for instruction. However, the other assistant superintendent was the chief of the department of instruction, and according to the rules of the board³ was directly responsible for instruction in the city schools. He has charge of the instructional phases only; and with the directors of instruction who are under this intermediary their influence is definitely felt in all schools of the city. The outstanding feature of this plan lies in the clear cut provisions in the board rules pertaining to the responsibilities of this assistant superintendent for instruction.

The school survey of Los Angeles, California, in 1934 indicated that the assistant superintendents were burdened with duties which are not instructional in nature.⁴ That educational leadership activities received very little attention from these administrative officers is shown by the following statement of the survey committee:

¹Survey Report of the Cincinnati, Ohio, Public Schools by the United States Office of Education, Report No. 64, pp. 277-278. Cincinnati: Bureau of Governmental Research, July, 1935.

²Ibid., pp. 289-290.

³Rules and Regulations of the Cincinnati Board of Education, pp. 20-21. Cincinnati: Board of Education, July, 1944.

⁴O. R. Hull and Willard Ford, Survey of the Los Angeles City Schools, pp. 105-110. Los Angeles: Board of Education, 1934.

Nine Assistant Superintendents are assigned to groups of schools. This assignment indicates that supervision and the direction of instruction are intended to be an important part of the Assistant Superintendent's activities. The number of schools assigned to each Assistant Superintendent is comparable to the schools of a city of 150,000 population. An Assistant Superintendent could profitably spend his full time in supervision of his group of schools.⁵

The survey committee presented numerical data which revealed the amount of time spent in school visitation per week and total hours spent in the schools. For example, the deputy superintendent spent ten hours in three days. The nine assistant superintendents spent from nineteen hours in five days to six hours in one day. The time spent in visitation varied from five to nineteen hours for the week; the number of days on which visits were made varied from one to five. The assistant superintendent having the highest total number of hours spent in visitation devoted some time to this activity on each of five days. The average per assistant superintendent per week was 10.5 hours or 2.1 hours per assistant superintendent per day. An average of about twenty-five per cent of each assistant superintendent's day was spent in school visiting.⁶

The activity analysis of the assistant superintendent shows evidence that little time is spent on educational leadership or planning for the betterment of the school instructional program. In general, the reports of visits to schools did not indicate the nature of the activity while at the school. However, some of the assistant superintendents reported that they held conferences with either the teachers or principals, and there is some evidence of class visitation; probably those who did not state specific activities were engaged in supervision.

The reasons for the paucity of influence on instruction by the intermediary officers in Los Angeles are explained by the survey as follows:

The wide distribution of functions among the Assistant Superintendents that are city-wide in scope has caused much overlapping, and has made it very difficult for a school principal to locate the particular Assistant Superintendent who is responsible at the time for the activity about which he is concerned.⁷

⁵Ibid., p. 108.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., pp. 106-107.

"The large number of detailed items that are not settled by the Assistant Superintendents is evidence of the fact that the wide distribution of assignments lead to ineffective results."⁸

The assistant superintendents were frequently interrupted in their work by a request to undertake some special assignment for the superintendent.

Data collected by the Assistant Superintendents for the survey staff showed that in one week, the intermediary officers in Los Angeles were responsible for forty-two special assignments. The following are examples of special assignments made to the assistant superintendents:

- a. Settlement of differences between parents and schools,
- b. preparation for Teachers' Institute,
- c. service on a committee of elementary superintendents regarding the rating of teachers,
- d. investigation and recommendation with respect to Dads' Clubs in elementary schools,
- e. responsibility for school exhibits in Los Angeles County Fair, (this assignment involved the direction of twenty-six operating committees)
- f. responsibility for the participation of the schools in the Community Chest,
- g. serve on a Committee to study local athletic situation and the California Interscholastic Federation,
- h. attendance at a meeting of City Planning Commission,
- i. have charge of radio spelling bee,
- j. responsibility for handling matters pertaining to two high school teachers who had incurred debts that were interfering with their teaching,
- k. investigation of the advisability of providing bus transportation to a high school,
- l. survey on all pupils attending a high school other than the one in their district of residence, and prepare report to the Board of Education.⁹

The Survey Commission held that these special assignments, with the many routine duties involved in the administration of regular assignments, encroach seriously upon the time which the assistant superintendent should spend on the supervision of schools.¹⁰

The Commission recommended that these special assignments should be removed from the assistant superintendent's duties and placed under the direction of other officers.

The survey findings revealed that during one week in

⁸Ibid., p. 106.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 106.

1934 the number of interviews held by each assistant superintendent varied from four to 118.¹¹ One assistant superintendent held sixty-three telephone conversations, and each of three assistant superintendents held over twenty conferences. The number of meetings held varied from one to six. One assistant superintendent engaged in twelve school activities during the week after 5:00 P.m., and six assistant superintendents finished the week with no late afternoon or evening assignments.

An analysis of the topics of 407 interviews held by the assistant superintendents indicates that 336 of the interviews were on matters of administration and supervision. Seventy-one of these interviews according to the Survey Commission appeared to deal with matters principally clerical in nature. The activity analysis indicates that managerial, clerical, and routine work consumed the time of the assistant superintendents to the neglect of educational leadership.¹²

The evidence showed that the intermediary officers concerned themselves only slightly with problems of instruction. Supervision was therefore seriously curtailed because of special assignments which had little or nothing to do with the improvement of instruction. Then, too, unimportant duties which cause frequent interruptions often compelled the intermediary officers in Los Angeles to delay the handling of more important problems. Moreover, the divided authority prevented assistant superintendents from getting things done which they consider necessary to the improvement of instruction.

The findings reveal a definite lack of coordination and articulation of responsibilities with respect to the duties of assistant superintendents. This results in confusion and delay. The signing of pupil transfers and permits for example is a routine function which takes much of the time and energy of the intermediary officers. Often after much time has been consumed by parents regarding the securing of permits, they appeal to higher authorities and their requests are granted.¹³ Most of these instances do not involve educational problems.

¹¹Ibid., p. 107. ¹²Ibid., pp. 107-108. ¹³Ibid., p. 109.

A large amount of time is also spent in taking care of special activities which have little to do with instruction. For instance, the activity of awarding legion awards, judging contests, procurement of speakers, evaluating accident reports, and checking telephone service, all preclude the assistant superintendents from giving time to problems of instruction.

The Survey Commission in its appraisal stated with regard to special activities assigned to assistant superintendents that "these interferences with school supervision constitute real difficulties."¹³ The practices in the Los Angeles schools relative to the uses made of intermediary officers were considered indefensible, and not germane to the essential function of the positions, the improvement of instruction.

The history of supervisory activities of intermediary officers in New York City is replete with recommendations for improvement of this service.

In 1924, the Survey Commission stated that the associate superintendents as organized did not have time to attend to the duties that compel the attention of the superintendent.

The chairman of the Survey Commission, Dr. Alderman, stated:

When I found that one man, an associate superintendent, in addition to his supervisory duties, with one helper, a district superintendent, was given not only the responsibility for new buildings but the duty of selecting sites as well, and also served on other committees, I was surprised.

This one example shows what is more or less true concerning the eight associate superintendents.¹⁴

The chairman of the Survey Commission further pointed out that, "each associate superintendent should be a specialist in the line of his assignment, yet we do not hesitate to say that each associate superintendent should be an educator of deep learning and broad experience."

In a survey of the New York Schools by a Joint Legislative Committee directed by Strayer in 1944 the following comment was made regarding intermediary officers:

¹³Ibid., p. 110.

¹⁴School Survey Committee, Report of the Survey of the School System of the City of New York, sec. A, pp. 32-39. New York: Board of Education, 1924.

Everywhere interviewers from the survey staff found that assistant superintendents are all but overwhelmed by the bulk of inspectorial duties and the responsibility for giving special attention to teachers and supervisory officers of limited experience or of relatively low efficiency.

Members of the survey staff found that every assistant superintendent in the field places a great emphasis on monthly meetings of principals.

Nearly every assistant superintendent presented evidence of a well organized and well directed meetings in which practically all teachers were drawn according to their interests and needs, and the needs of the school.

On the other hand the visitors found a number of assistant superintendents busy analyzing special reports from teachers on individual pupils and preparing themselves for supervisory visits during which they hoped to help the teachers in question to solve problems of guidance, teaching, and learning.¹

With reference to the overall appraisal of the functions of assistant superintendents in the field, the Commission stated: "The assistant superintendent in the field carries too heavy a load of directed work."²

The Commission pointed out certain very definite handicaps which preclude assistant superintendents in the field from performing efficient educational leadership in the New York City schools. These handicaps are: (1) too much routine work; (2) too many extraordinary demands from too many persons in the headquarters; and (3) too little assistance.³

It may be said that the assistant superintendents felt keenly the handicaps under which they worked. In spite of these handicaps, the Survey Commission commended the work of assistant superintendents in the city of New York:

In spite of this handicap and the handicap of a heavy load of directed routine work, many assistant superintendents have shown amazing capacity for educational leadership.

The last printed report of the assistant superintendents gives evidence of group leadership in identifying major educational problems, and organizing minor problems . . . and in securing the cooperation of teachers and principals in their solution.⁴

The survey staff further appraised the influence of assistant superintendents as follows:

¹George D. Strayer, Report of the New York City Sub Committee of the Joint Legislative Committee on the State Educational System, pp. 119-144. Legislative Document No. 60. Albany: Williams Press Inc., 1944.

²Ibid., p. 125.

³Ibid., p. 133.

⁴Ibid., p. 134.

The survey staff finds that, in more recent years, assistant superintendents, individually and as a group, have accepted or devised comprehensive plans into which the details of a program of modern education naturally fall. They have also begun to develop these plans cooperatively from objective data. This is a distinct gain for the teacher and the child, and hence, for the development of creative educational leadership on the part of the assistant superintendent.⁵

These statements gave an impetus to reforms which followed, and which affected the duties of intermediary officers in the New York City Schools. In 1935, the Association of Assistant Superintendents appointed a Committee to study the functions of educational leadership of intermediary officers in New York City. In a report this Committee issued the following statement:

The functions of the Assistant Superintendents were grouped under three captions: (1) Administration, (2) Supervisory, and (3) Community Activities. Generally speaking, more opportunities exist for the exercise of leadership in supervisory and community activities than in the administrative areas. Yet administrative activities are frequently "must" functions in that they provide the means and remove obstacles to an effective supervisory and community program.⁶

In an attempt to identify specific activities of intermediary officers, the Committee appraised the individual activities in the recent job analysis of the position. These activities ranged from those which require the immediate personal attention of the intermediary officer to those which are so routine that they may be delegated to his office staff for disposition and follow up. Midway in this distribution are those activities which lend themselves to committee consideration under the general supervision of the assistant superintendent.⁷

Among the many activities of the intermediary officers in New York City the supervisory functions definitely assume first place. In this connection the Committee recommended that the intermediary officer attempt to render his most valuable service only through professional leadership activities. Administrative efficiency should be considered merely a means toward this end.⁸

⁵Ibid., p. 140.

⁶Frederic C. Pertsch and Others, Report of Committee of the Association of Assistant Superintendents, Article 1, p. 1. New York: Board of Education, 1935.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., Appendix A, p. 6.

The Committee adopted the following pattern of activities with regard to the improvement of instruction:

The intermediary officer should exercise educational leadership through:

- I. Establishing morale among the teachers and supervisors within his district by
 1. Setting up realizable professional ideals, standards, and goals.
 2. Stimulating professional growth.
 - a. Encouraging the professional staff to read professional literature, study curriculum bulletins, observe good procedures, attend conferences, and produce helpful bulletins.
 - b. Instituting teacher training and demonstration centers for the better understanding of children and improved methods of instruction.
 3. Developing initiative and interest in his staff.
 4. Encouraging leaders to experiment and to assume professional responsibility.
 5. Inspecting, helping, and guiding inefficient teachers and supervisors.
 6. Reporting supervisors and teachers who remain inefficient.
- II. Interpreting, adapting, and implementing the curriculum by
 1. Setting up a district program of professional study.
 2. Pooling professional resources through workshops and study groups, experiments and demonstrations.
- III. Encouraging experimentation through
 1. Organizing special classes for the intellectually gifted, the retarded, the maladjusted, the delinquent, the intellectually or physically handicapped, and other deviates.
 2. Trying out improved techniques, such as remedial instruction, individual instruction, etc.
 3. Encouraging professional research on a group of individual basis.
 4. Surveying the basic problems of health education, consumer education, conservation, and other areas.
- IV. Evaluating performance and progress by
 1. Visiting schools.
 2. Initiating cooperative and constructive studies of local projects.
 3. Conducting a testing program.
 4. Securing objective reports of local progress.
- V. Coordinating the instructional services in the district by
 1. Developing a program of articulation between schools of different levels and types.
 2. Setting up an adequate program of pupil guidance.
 3. Encouraging parent participation in the program of elementary education.

4. Integrating the services of other city departments with the local educational program.
5. Utilizing the advisory services of directors of special branches and activities.

- VI. Establishing professional contacts and service by
1. Being a student himself.
 2. Serving on professional committees of the Association of Assistant Superintendents.
 3. Acting as educational consultant for local agencies.
 4. Identifying himself with professional, civic, and welfare groups interested in serving the best interests of childhood.⁹

In accordance with this proposed program for the supervision of instruction in New York City the work of intermediary officers took on a more productive aspect toward instruction than previously. There are, however, several factors which impede the educational influence of intermediary officers. The Committee of Assistant Superintendents in its report stated the factors in this manner:

Among the many considerations, the supervisory load assigned to the Assistant Superintendents definitely assumes first place. From the numerical standpoint, the Assistant Superintendent in New York City supervises a group of teachers and pupils approximately equal to that of Albany. What is more important, however, is the varied nature of the local communities encompassed within most Assistant Superintendents' districts. This is probably as it should be--each district representing a cross-section of American urban life. Yet the fact remains that the resulting pattern of heterogeneity complicates the policy of adopting city-wide policies to local needs. District-wide adoptions will not suffice. Adjustment must be made in terms of individual school situation.¹⁰

The complexity and the territorial extent of schools in New York City offer a distinct professional challenge to all the intermediary officers in the school system of that city. Accordingly, then the division of duties for intermediary officers in New York City has been based on the policy of improvement of instruction. The following table indicates the duties of associate superintendents, who are members of the Board of Superintendents.

The findings indicate that a large percentage of the duties of the seven intermediary officers in New York City pertain to problems of instruction. The eighth gives all his time to

⁹Ibid., pp. 6-7.

¹⁰Ibid., sec. 2, p. 2.

TABLE 12

DUTIES ASSIGNED TO ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENTS
IN NEW YORK CITY,¹ 1942-1943

Assignment of Duties to Associate Superintendents	Instructional Duties
Division I <u>Academic High Schools</u>	Coordination of work with Directors. Cooperation with Division of Curriculum. Supervision of Directors at high school level.
Division II <u>Vocational High Schools</u>	Supervision and training of Directors of Vocational High School. Cooperation with Division of Curriculum. Inservice Training Program for War Industries Training.
Division III <u>Junior High Schools</u>	Administration and Supervision of Junior High Schools. Supervision of Directors of Junior High Schools. Supervision of teachers assigned to Industrial Arts and Shop Work. Cooperation with the Division of Curriculum Development.
Division IV <u>Elementary Schools</u>	Supervision of Elementary Schools. Supervision of Directors of Elementary School Level. Cooperation with Division of Curriculum Development.
Division V <u>Curriculum Development</u>	Direction of Curriculum Council. Coordination of Curriculum Committees. Direction and preparation of courses of study, syllabi, and other curricular publications. Selection of Teaching Materials: textbooks, visual and objective aids. Supervision of the Superintendent of Libraries, Assistant Director of Visual Instruction and Committee on Textbooks.

¹Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of City of New York, pp. 10-11. New York: Board of Education, 1942-1943.

TABLE 12--Continued

Assignment of Duties to Associate Superintendents	Instructional Duties
Division VI <u>Child Welfare</u>	Supervision of Bureau of Child Guidance, Health Activities, Directors of Speech and Physically Handicapped. Supervision of Braille Education and Schools for the Deaf. Cooperation with Division of Curriculum Development. Supervision of Probationary Schools.
Division VII <u>Personnel and Teacher Training</u>	Teacher training and supervision of inservice courses. Development of teacher training program in relation to curriculum. Cooperation with colleges, universities, museums and other agencies of teacher training. Co-chairman of curriculum council and curriculum committees.
Division VIII <u>Housing and Business</u>	All problems of housing, business administration and community activities are assigned to this associate superintendent. This intermediary officer is also the Superintendent of School Supplies.

administrative details. This division of duties avoids confusion and makes for systematic coordination of responsibilities. Definite assignment of duties precludes misunderstandings and waste of time. This organization and emphasis on instructional problems in the 733 schools in New York City with 30,000 teachers and 863,000 children, should make for instructional efficiency on the part of the associate superintendents. The superintendent in his report for 1944-1945 expressed satisfaction with the inservice training program:

The inservice training program for all teachers at all levels was greatly enlarged during the year. Nearly 10,000 teachers were enrolled in approximately 500 courses conducted by our In-Service Institutes. Next year it is planned to double the number of teachers enrolled.

More than half of the principals and other heads of elementary schools have attended institutes.¹

¹Ibid, p. 9, 1944-1945.

The personnel in these inservice institutes are associate and assistant superintendents, principals, and directors. The superintendent in the same report stated the policy regarding the function of the Division of Personnel which is headed by one of the associate superintendents: ". . . The Division of Personnel is concerned chiefly with stimulating professional growth, its administrative controls and procedures are not mere matters of routine."²

The results of this policy paid rich dividends, especially with teachers who generally did not show interest in their work. Through participation in some type of school activity such teachers were stimulated to make professional growth.

As a result of this forward and progressive policy registration in Inservice Courses increased from 900 in September 1944 to 3,708 in February 1945.³

The inservice education of teachers, principals, and directors who attended the institutes supervised by the intermediary officers was favorably evaluated by the superintendent who promised that in 1946-47, workshops, practicums, conferences, and reading would be pursued to determine the most effective methods that may be employed in teaching teachers.⁴

The thirty-three assistant superintendents in the New York City schools are assigned to districts. Each district compares in extent with an entire school system in many cities. The district office is a clearing house for all matters pertaining to the schools of the district. The activities of that office are many and varied. A multiplicity of miscellaneous matters takes up a great deal of the local superintendent's time and energy.⁵

There are four local school boards which work in cooperation with the assistant superintendent assigned to these districts. These boards, in addition to routine matters dealt with at the monthly meetings, have been active in urging improvements in school buildings. Careful surveys have been made by them and

²Ibid., p. 41.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Annual Reports of the Assistant Superintendents in the Field of the City of New York, p. 4, 1935-1936.

reports sent to the central office.⁶

With respect to the educational leadership of assistant superintendents, their reports for the years 1935-1936 reveal many problems. One assistant superintendent said:

We faced the year with an attitude of study and research. In conference we decided on several outstanding problems for study and discussion. Among these were:

The study of our neighborhoods and of the relation of the school and the principal to the life of the community.

The philosophy of the activity program and the practical details of the introduction into our schools.

The improvement of instruction in reading.

A general testing program based on a study of district tests in reading and arithmetic.

The schools in this district have worked out careful diagnostic procedures and devices for each reading weakness.

School after school reports that teachers in increasing numbers are interested in community cooperation, in professional reading, professional courses, in experimenting with progressive methods and in joining professional societies for the improvement of educational practice.⁷

The assistant superintendents in New York City have assumed professional leadership in their districts and have made their influence felt on instruction. However, they are very seriously handicapped in their supervisory activities by many administrative details. For instance, one assistant superintendent has expressed his sentiments in no uncertain terms regarding the overburdening of the district office with petty details and the need for some redistribution of the work.⁸

Another assistant superintendent was even more emphatic on this point, stating that for years teachers, principals, and assistant superintendents had complained of the burden of ever increasing administrative duties which, at times, threatened to become a load that would impair the educational function of the schools. Although the Central Office had always turned a sympathetic ear to these complaints, no effective remedies had yet been applied.⁹

It is apparent that the potentialities of educational statesmanship on the part of assistant superintendents in New York City are seriously impaired by too many delegated petty

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., pp. 26-38.

⁸Ibid., p. 4.

⁹Ibid., p. 208.

administrative duties. Because of this situation, their usefulness in dealing with problems of instruction is definitely curtailed.

In Providence, Rhode Island, the intermediary officers have definite professional relationships to the program of instruction. On this point Reavis states that, "certain parts of the administrative organization are complicated and result in a roundabout way of exercising authority in special fields."¹

The relations of deputy superintendents to principals are determined by the superintendent. One deputy superintendent is a line officer and is held directly responsible to the superintendent for all instructional services of the entire school system.² The other deputy superintendent is a staff officer as far as the educational functions of the schools are concerned. His educational contribution "is mainly to direct, coordinate, supervise, and advise in the special fields of visual education, music, art, health, and physical education."³ In this respect the organization appears to be complicated.

Reavis gives an example to illustrate the roundabout way in which the deputy and assistant superintendents find their work difficult with respect to instruction:

A principal observes that there is faulty teaching in art. The principal would be expected to consult his assistant superintendent, who, in turn would consult the director of art. If the case demanded action, however, it would be necessary for the principal or assistant superintendent to consult the deputy superintendent of instruction, who, in turn, would consult the deputy superintendent in charge of art, and tell him what must be done.⁴

From the above illustration, it is apparent that whatever influence the deputy superintendent of instruction has on problems of teaching, this influence comes in a very roundabout way. A new policy with respect to this division of duties and coordination of responsibilities as it affects the deputy superintendent should be developed.

The assistant superintendent in charge of research, guidance, and attendance makes a definite contribution to instruction

¹William C. Reavis, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities, op. cit., pp. 256-258.

²Ibid., p. 257.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 258.

in the Providence schools. Reavis points out that "much of the efficiency of the Providence schools is attributed to the personnel and administration of this office."⁵

The principals have been "furnished with data and services which were not obtainable without a centralized guidance program."⁶ The effect of this office upon principals and the conduct of the schools is manifested in the changes that have taken place with respect to discipline. The establishment of a guidance program under the supervision of an assistant superintendent eventually eliminated the need for disciplinary schools.

The guidance function of the elementary-and high-school principal as interpreted by the assistant superintendent in charge of this function helped the principals in: (1) organizing a guidance program in their schools, (2) bringing about better methods in the selection of supervisors and their training programs, and (3) revising the school program and curriculum.⁷

Principals in Providence have many contacts with the assistant superintendents, since they are directly responsible to them in educational matters.⁸ However, the assistant superintendents have no more control over the principals than what is permitted by the deputy superintendent. Reavis states that:

From information gathered through interviews it appears that assistant superintendents and principals in Providence work harmoniously in a common cause. Assistant superintendents often preside at principals' meetings but do not dominate the discussion.

Cooperation between the assistant superintendent and his principals is manifested in curriculum-building.⁹

From the foregoing evidence, the generalization is warranted that intermediary officers in Providence influence instruction to a considerable degree, but that roundabout procedures handicap them in their efforts to influence instruction.

With the emphasis upon the child and his welfare as the first consideration in school procedure, the program of supervision in Rochester, New York, is designed to improve classroom instruction. The Survey Commission in a study of Rochester's schools in 1928 found that "the assistant superintendents in this city consider supervision their main responsibility. They develop

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 258.

⁸Ibid., p. 259.

⁹Ibid.

and centralize the city supervisory activities."¹ These activities include such procedures as institutes, special meetings for the discussion of particular aspects of classroom work, bi-weekly classes for special help to teachers, and organization of demonstration classes.

The Survey Commission further stated:

The local supervision is highly successful in establishing a cooperative atmosphere is evidenced by the fact that teachers frequently request visits by their principals, supervisors and directors when they need assistance or when they want the judgment of another person concerning their work. Fear does not enter into the situation with the conscientious teacher.²

Thus, under the organization indicated "the supervisory staff and the teachers no longer consider themselves in hostile camps."³ These practices in Rochester help to maintain high standards of instruction in which intermediary officers have a large share.

In a report of a Survey Commission for the schools of Grand Rapids, Michigan, the members of the survey staff agreed that:

The point in the school system of Grand Rapids where a conscious effort to improve is most urgently needed is among the elementary principals. They need to study the methods of supervision which are based on scientific tests. Many of them have at the present time scant sympathy with scientific work in education. The city has a right to demand much of these principals which is not included in mere routine.⁴

These findings indicate that the superintendent or the assistant has not exercised effective educational leadership among the principals.

As early as 1916, Franklin Bobbitt in a survey of the schools of Denver, Colorado, expressed the aim of school activity as "The only thing to be aimed at in the work of the schools is

¹Herbert U. West and Others, The Work of the Public Schools of the City of Rochester, New York, pp. 589-590, 1928.

²Ibid., p. 590.

³Ibid.

⁴Charles H. Judd, Survey of Grand Rapids, Michigan, Schools, pp. 33-35. Grand Rapids: Board of Education, 1916.

the training of the children."¹

The means, agencies, and other factors of training that the superintendent must control in order to do his work, include the professional influence of his helpers on instruction.

Bobbitt in recommending the establishment of the office of assistant superintendent in the city of Denver said:

The new intermediary office is clearly designed upon the principle that the training of the children is to be the central purpose in the control of everything involved. It recognizes the Unity of Ends, and, therefore, the need of Unity in the Control of the Means.²

The survey report points out definite weaknesses in the Denver schools in terms of the principles stated. It said that, "there is a paucity of unity"³ with respect to the general program in the training of the children.

Many teachers and principals have not sufficiently defined in their own minds the purposes which should control in their work. In far too many cases they are merely mechanically turning the wheels of the educational machine in the ways that they have learned largely through tradition without knowing exactly what products they are expected to turn out, or whether their labors are actually securing a sufficient measure of these products. Too often principals are not bringing methods up to a proper degree of efficiency. In order to improve this situation, the thing needed is organization and leadership that will vitalize everything and everybody within the school system, and thus eliminate the slackness, the inequality, and the inefficiency. Qualified assistant superintendents in charge of instruction will pay their way many times.⁴

The extent of the improvement in the supervision of instruction resulting from the influence of intermediary officers following the survey is discussed in the superintendent's report.

- a) Committees were organized and trained for the purpose of revision of the curriculum.
- b) Research was definitely planned and experimentation in methods and curricula was carried out in various schools.

¹Franklin Bobbitt, Report of the School Survey of Denver, Colorado, Part I, p. 35. Denver: Board of Education, 1916.

²Ibid., pp. 36-37. ³Ibid., p. 37. ⁴Ibid., p. 43.

- c) A supervision council composed of teachers, principals, and supervisors was organized.
- d) Classroom visitation, conferences with teachers, demonstration teaching, and every other activity of supervision were carried out as nearly as possible in a spirit of cooperation and helpfulness.¹

The instructional aspect of the Denver schools took on a more significant meaning after the appointment of an intermediary officer in charge of instruction. The faculties of the various schools said the superintendent, "are becoming more and more centers for general and professional study."²

The supervisory force was reorganized and supervision of instruction was centered for all grades under the direction of an assistant superintendent of schools chosen with this particular work in mind.³ Moreover, the supervisors, principals, and teachers developed a point of view which helped them in the solution of their classroom problems.⁴

The program of supervision of instruction by assistant superintendents was highly praised by the superintendent in his report for the four year period from August, 1923 to July, 1927. He stated:

There is abundant evidence of improvement in teaching throughout the city. Out of study and investigation and research in connection with making courses of study have come innumerable suggestions as to classroom procedures. Most teachers are eager for light on methods. Abundant evidence comes from the department of measurements, from the reports of principals and supervisors, and from the reports of teachers themselves as to improved techniques in teaching.⁵

In 1924, the Denver curriculum revision program attracted wide attention throughout the country. This work was supervised by the intermediary officer, who made a distinct contribution to the course of study. The training of teachers, principals, and

¹Twentieth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Denver, Colorado, pp. 21-23, sec. 1, 1922-1923.

²Ibid., p. 22.

³Ibid., p. 21.

⁴Ibid., p. 22.

⁵Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Denver, Colorado, pp. 21-24, sec. 1, 1926-1927.

the supervisors by the deputy and assistant superintendents "made them better able to interpret the schools to the people as a result of their study of curricula and methods."⁶

In general, Bobbit found that the intermediary officers in Denver contributed to the program of instruction through organizing and directing committees to study problems of instruction and through encouraging teachers, principals, and supervisors to participate in the solution of problems of instruction during the meetings of the Council on Supervision. In this way they improved teaching and learning in the Denver schools.

The efficiency of the work done in a particular system regarding instruction is, in a large measure, dependent upon the leadership of school principals. Through them the work of all concerned with instruction can be made productive, or otherwise.

The principals in Springfield, Massachusetts, were reported by the survey staff as "absorbed in details of administrative work, such as checking attendance, answering telephone calls, making out records, and performing many other minor details."⁷ The survey report suggested that guidance with reference to supervisory functions of the principals should emanate from the assistant superintendent.⁸ However, the administrative duties of the assistant superintendent were so numerous that he found it difficult to visit schools and to give direct help to the principals. At the very best, his influence on instruction was casual because of the many administration duties delegated to him. Among them were: to have charge of inventories, to oversee finance and business bureaus, to assist the superintendent in the many details at the office, and to report on inefficient teachers. It is evident that little time was left for direct supervision of instruction. Therefore, the improvement of instruction was delegated to the special supervisors and the principals.

The New Bedford, Massachusetts, School Survey in 1922 recommended that, "The supervisory principals should be directly

⁶Ibid., p. 24.

⁷George D. Strayer, Survey of Springfield Schools, op. cit. pp. 37-38.

⁸Ibid.

responsible to the assistant superintendent for all instruction and under his direction make plans for supervision.¹ It further recommended that:

All schools should be brought under a single head, an assistant superintendent, who should be thoroughly competent in education and experience to handle the administrative and supervisory problems involved.²

In reports to the superintendent of schools in 1938 and 1940 the assistant superintendent referred to his influence on instruction in part:

Extending the assistant superintendent's responsibilities very definitely to all grades above the sixth has set up a very clear objective, the coordination of the work in the seventh, eighth and ninth grades throughout the city.³

Members of the educational department met each Monday from four to five thirty for fifteen weeks to discuss school problems, exchange opinions regarding educational principles, policies, and procedures and seek information that would lead to greater understanding of the work in which they are engaged. A second group was formed in the second term of 1939-1940 and a third group is finishing its studies this present month.

This office seeks to encourage the formation of such groups and is ready to help in initiating, and furthering studies of this kind for any who wish it.⁴

In Sacramento, California, the Survey Commission appraised the supervisory functions of the four intermediary officers as follows: "As to supervision there is certainly not too much at the present time, though it is not believed that this is due to serious shortage in staff."⁵

In another part of the report, the Survey Committee criticized the school principals for ineffective work:

It is recommended that this work be more carefully organized. Some members of the staff have ceased to study and

¹Frank E. Spaulding, Principles, Policies and Plans for the Improvement of the New Bedford Public Schools, p. 41. New Bedford: School Committee, 1922.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the School Committee and the Superintendent of Schools of the City of New Bedford, Massachusetts, pp. 24-26, 1940.

⁴Ibid., pp. 24-25, 1938.

⁵Jesse B. Sears, Sacramento School Survey, Vol. I, p. 71. Sacramento, California: Board of Education, 1928.

their work shows it very clearly. If every principal were required to do some planning on this matter and to discuss those plans with the Intermediary Officers at the beginning of the year, and to report progress at intervals it would discourage the sort of professional drifting that is clearly apparent in certain places where there should be progressive intellectual leadership.⁶

It is evident that whatever has been done with respect to the improvement of instruction in Sacramento much more needed to be done and much of the initiative for this lies rested with the intermediary officers.

The school system of Washington, D. C., employs supervising principals who hold a prominent position in the administration and supervision of schools. As early as 1872 the superintendent pointed out the need of professionally trained men to perform the many administrative and supervisory functions previously attempted by the school trustees. In compliance with the recommendations of the superintendent the position of supervising principal for white schools was established in 1873.⁷

The results obtained from the work of the supervising principals in the white schools were so gratifying that the plan was introduced, in 1882, in the colored schools.⁸

A supervisory principal has supervisory and administrative authority over all the elementary schools in his division.

In October, 1945 there were nine such divisions, five for white and four for colored. These intermediaries are line officers and their relation with the central office have frequently been redefined.⁹ The supervising principals in the white schools are directly responsible to the first assistant superintendent who in turn is responsible to the superintendent for the administration of elementary schools. In the colored schools the supervising principals are responsible to the first assistant superintendent through the assistant superintendent in charge of elementary schools.¹⁰

⁶Ibid., p. 83.

⁷William C. Reavis, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities, op. cit., pp. 339-341.

⁸Ibid., p. 340.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 341.

One of the important problems discussed by the Survey Commission in Baltimore, Maryland, was the improvement of supervision by the assistant superintendent in charge of junior and senior high school.

The important problems to be considered by the assistant superintendent in charge of junior and senior high schools is that of providing adequate supervision of teaching in these schools.

In like manner Baltimore faces the problems of developing a group of highly efficient building principals for the elementary schools, or of providing for the more important part of the supervision in these schools by means of officers attached to the central office and responsible for the work throughout the system.¹

It is implied that the assistant superintendent in Baltimore up to 1921 did not exert an important influence on the improvement of instruction.

In a survey study of Youngstown schools in 1931, the commission's report revealed that there were three chief executive officers who were theoretically coordinate in authority, the Superintendent of Schools, the Director of Schools, and the Clerk-Treasurer. In reality there is a dual executive control with the superintendent of schools and the director of schools as heads of the instructional and business departments.²

The commission in its recommendation stated that a change of organization was necessary. There should be, the commission stated, two assistant superintendents of schools, one for education and one for business. They should be responsible to the superintendent and to him alone. All of their acts should be subject to his review. They should act as advisory officers in assisting him to manage the schools.³ Moreover, the Assistant Superintendent for Business would ordinarily be given control of the property of the district and of its operation and maintenance. He would also act for the superintendent in all matters pertaining

¹George D. Strayer and Others, Survey of Baltimore Schools, pp. 17-18. New York: Division of Field Studies, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1921.

²United States Office of Education, Report of the Youngstown School Survey, p. 20. Youngstown: Chamber of Commerce, December 18, 1931.

³Ibid., p. 51.

to the erection of new buildings and, to such extent as he desired, in the selection of sites, purchases of sites, and in the planning of new buildings or additions to old ones. All purchases would be under his charge as would also all repairs and the physical distribution of supplies. The cost accounting for schools would also be carried out under his direction in accordance with such plans of accounting as are approved by the superintendent. He would also be expected to make reports to the superintendent upon all those matters as would be necessary.⁴

The adoption of such a plan of administrative procedure in Youngstown would in the opinion of the survey staff have a wholesome effect on the educational services in schools.⁵

In the judgment of the survey staff, the administration of schools in Newark, New Jersey, should be greatly improved and made more efficient if a principle of unified administration is to be reached. The present form of organization found at the time of the survey did not contribute to the efficiency of the administration of schools in Newark.⁶

The creation of the office of deputy superintendent was recommended as being essential for the effective administration of the school system.⁷ No chief executive can be expected to be on duty at all times, nor can he be expected to handle all the details associated with his office. If a deputy is employed, he would be expected to relieve the superintendent of many of his duties, at least those which do not involve the determination of policy. It is suggested that the deputy superintendent might be expected to carry a large degree of responsibility in the preparation of the annual budget.⁸ He might, whenever necessary, act in the place of the superintendent in practically all matters having to do with the execution of policies already adopted. The deputy superintendent should also be given a large responsibility in the field of public relations.⁹

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶George D. Strayer, Report of a Survey of Public Schools of Newark, New Jersey, p. 13. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1942.

⁷Ibid., p. 13.

⁸Ibid., p. 14.

⁹Ibid.

A major function to be served by an assistant superintendent lies in the fields of teaching, curriculum, and special services. This officer should be given general responsibility for all supervision.¹⁰

A second assistant superintendent is designated to have charge of personnel. This is a major task of administration and should be placed in the hands of one holding the rank of assistant superintendent.¹¹

A third assistant superintendent will have charge of business affairs. He will have under his supervision a Director of Finance and Accounting, a Director of Plants, a Director of Supplies and Equipment, and a Director of Cafeterias.¹²

A fourth assistant superintendent of schools is responsible for administration. The purpose of this assignment is to place in the administrative organization a competent officer who can meet the demands of teachers, principals, and other administrative officers for interpretations of policy and for advice with respect to administrative procedures. He should sit with the other assistant superintendent on the Cabinet of the Superintendent of Schools whenever problems of program and policy are considered. It is the judgment of survey staff, however, that the multitude of issues which come to the central office for determination cannot satisfactorily be distributed among several assistant superintendents without impairing their efficiency.¹³

A competent assistant superintendent for administration would occupy a most important position in interpreting the work of the public schools to his professional colleagues and the public. His task would be constant translation of general policy into daily action in the schools. This assistant would also accept the responsibility for pupil accounting and statistical reports.¹⁴

In 1936, however, the assistant superintendents with the superintendent formed a Board of Superintendents.¹⁵ The purpose

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid., p. 15.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁵One hundred and ninth Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore City, pp. 23-25. Baltimore: School Commissioners, 1937.

of this board was to secure information on problems of teaching and to give attention in the form of constructive ideas and suggestions for improving teaching.

During school years of 1936-37 and 1937-38 the assistant superintendents as members of the Board of Superintendents conducted a new type of inservice training course for principals, teachers, and supervisors. The report for 1937 indicates that a series of six lectures¹⁶ was given by assistant superintendents on the following subjects:

- (1) Professional Ethics in Public Education
- (2) Relationship with the Community and the Public
- (3) The Duties of Vice Principals
- (4) School Housekeeping
- (5) School Office Procedure
- (6) The Business Affairs of the Schools

The superintendent in his annual report to the board of education stated with reference to this service that it was a valuable form of inservice training.¹⁷

One of the most promising activities of the assistant superintendent in Baltimore was their supervisory activities in the reading program of the schools.¹⁸ In addition to their leadership rendered to the staff in the various experimental undertakings their services were extended to a variety of fields for the general improvement of instruction.¹⁹

The elementary schools of Baltimore exhibit a wide variety of internal features in their organization. One of these is the demonstration center. This agency of inservice training provides a systematic plan for lesson demonstrations to which all teachers are invited. This plan permitted the observers to see demonstrated integrated classroom lessons with a single center of interest. In planning these series of lessons an attempt was made to improve the teachers and principals, also the supervisors in service. The intermediary officers are responsible for a large measure of success attained in the program of inservice of the teaching in Baltimore. Their influence was both direct and

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁸ One hundred and eleventh Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore City, p. 71. Baltimore: School Commissioners, June 30, 1940.

¹⁹ Ibid.

indirect. Nevertheless, evidence supports the generalization that a sincere attempt is made by the intermediary officers in Baltimore to improve instruction.

Seattle, Washington, employs four assistant superintendents. One is in charge of curriculum and research and also of the child guidance clinic. In these functions he has two assistants or directors. They visit schools and aid the principals and teachers. The assistant superintendent has direct relationship with the principals, only through these directors.¹ This assistant superintendent, however, occupies a strategic position with respect to the improvement of instruction. He gives impetus to instruction by his supervisory activities in the curriculum and child guidance. He stands in a position to the principal as an advisor with reference to use of improved teaching techniques, the interpretation and modification of the curriculum, and inservice training of staff. This assistant superintendent exercises an important influence on instruction, and as a result of this function the general welfare of the system is advanced.²

Two assistant superintendents are in charge of divisions; one of elementary and junior high schools; the other, in charge of senior and vocational schools. They are assisted by administrative assistants and special subject supervisors. Examination of the duties of these assistant superintendents reveals that administrative, organizational, and personnel problems dominate the interests and duties of these intermediaries. The multiplicity of duties incident to attendance, occupy the senior high school assistant superintendent's time to a large degree. He finds little time to give direct attention to problems of instruction. These are delegated, in a large measure, to the supervisors who are direct representatives of the superintendent.³

Table 13 lists the duties performed by intermediary officers with respect to instruction in fifty-seven large cities. The nine areas of instruction presented in the table represent the major functions of instruction as revealed by data considered in this chapter. These areas of instruction encompass semi-

¹William C. Reavis, Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities, op. cit., pp. 283-284.

²Ibid., p. 290.

³Ibid., p. 289.

supervisory duties which the assistant superintendents perform as heads of senior and junior divisions.

TABLE 13

DUTIES PERFORMED BY INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS
IN RELATION TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF
INSTRUCTION IN FIFTY-SEVEN CITIES

Duties Performed	No. of Cities in Which Were Performed	Percent of Cities in Which Duties Were Performed
1. Advises principals on problems of instruction as per superintendent's program	37	65
2. Visits schools and helps principal and teachers with teaching and learning problems	37	65
3. Holds conferences with inefficient teachers and principals to help them to improve their efficiency	32	56
4. Directs curriculum and research studies and helps principals in the interpretation of curriculum objectives and findings	27	47
5. Organizes and directs and in-service training program	26	46
6. Advises schools through a supervisor	23	40
7. Advises principals and teachers on materials of instruction which help the teachers	21	37
8. Directs teacher study groups	16	28
9. Directs teacher training centers	3	6

The data presented in Table 13 reveal that intermediary officers do not influence instruction directly in all the cities studied. Except as they directly advise the principals on problems of instruction in sixty-five per cent of the cities and hold conferences with inefficient principals and teachers in fifty-six per cent of the cities, their influence on other areas of

instruction is felt in less than half of the cities.

The lowest area of influence on instruction, namely, the direction of teachers' centers is exercised in only three cities (New York, Baltimore and Buffalo). This should not be regarded too critically, since fifty-four out of fifty-seven cities do not have centers to which inefficient teachers may be sent for re-training, but have other means to improve teachers in service.

Data also reveal that in only forty-six per cent of the cities is found a program of inservice training of staff conducted by the intermediary officers. Sixteen cities, or thirty-seven per cent of the total number, have their intermediary officers direct teachers' study groups. Intermediary officers advise teachers through supervision in forty per cent of the cities.

Since intermediary officers in most cities in this study do not directly influence instruction, there must be definite reasons for this state of conditions.

Data secured from answers to a questionnaire sent to fifty-seven city school systems in October 1945, together with evidence secured from survey studies reveal that twelve different reasons have operated as obstacles to educational leadership. These obstacles are listed for each city in Table 14.

The evidence in the table reveals that in fifty cities or eighty seven per cent of the total (57) number of cities in this study, the intermediary officers are precluded from exercising more influence on instruction because they have too many administrative duties assigned to them.

There are forty-four cities who assign to their intermediary officers emergency duties, such as special drives, collections, reports, and assignments, all of which consume much time and prevent these officers from giving more attention to problems of instruction.

Data reveal that in thirty-two cities the intermediary officers are duplicating each others' efforts because their duties overlap.

There are twenty-two cities who delegate inventory and transfer of supplies duties to their intermediary officers; and twenty cities assign to their intermediary officers duties pertaining to transfer and assignment of personnel.

In eighteen cities or nearly a third of the fifty-seven cities in this study there is no apparent and definite policy

TABLE 14

OBSTACLES WHICH PREVENT INTERMEDIARY OFFICERS
FROM DEVOTING EFFORTS TO IMPROVEMENT OF
INSTRUCTION IN THE FIFTY-SEVEN CITIES

Cities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Too many administrative duties delegated by the superintendent	Lack of coordination of duties in supervision	Responsible for inventory and transfer of supplies	Abundance of clerical work	Special emergency duties such as reports on collections, tests, sales and drives	Personnel assignments and transfers	Confusion regarding relation to instruction	Responsible for finances, budget items	Frequent conferences with parents and patrons	Rigid plan of organization	Overlapping of duties of administration and supervision	Lack of definite policy on supervision by intermediaries
Atlanta, Ga.	x		x		x	x					x	
Baltimore, Md.	x			x							x	
Boston, Mass.	x				x	x						
Buffalo, N. Y.	x	x		x	x	x				x	x	x
Charlotte, N. C.	x		x	x	x							
Chicago, Ill.	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x
Cincinnati, Ohio	x										x	
Cleveland, Ohio	x				x						x	
Columbus, Ohio	x											
Dayton, Ohio	x		x		x							
Denver, Colo.	x			x	x						x	
Des Moines, Iowa	x	x			x	x						
Detroit, Mich.	x		x		x			x	x		x	
Duluth, Minn.	x			x	x							x

TABLE 14--Continued

Cities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Too many administrative duties delegated by the superintendent	Lack of coordination of duties in supervision	Responsible for inventory and transfer of supplies	Abundance of clerical work	Special emergency duties such as reports on collections, tests, sales and drives	Personnel assignments and transfers	Confusion regarding relation to instruction	Responsible for finances, budget items	Frequent conferences with parents and patrons	Picnic plan of organization	Overlapping of duties of administration and supervision	Lack of definite policy on supervision by intermediaries
Erie, Pa.	x		x	x	x							
Flint, Mich.	x			x	x							x
Fort Worth, Tex.	x	x			x							x
Gary, Ind.			x	x				x		x		
Grand Rapids, Mich.	x			x	x			x				x
Houston, Tex.	x		x		x							
Indianapolis, Ind.	x				x	x						x
Jacksonville, Fla.	x	x			x							x
Kansas City, Mo.	x		x		x	x		x			x	
Long Beach, Calif.	x	x	x		x							x
Los Angeles, Calif.	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
Louisville, Ky.	x	x	x		x						x	x
Milwaukee, Wis.	x		x	x	x	x						
Minneapolis, Minn.	x				x	x					x	
Newark, N. J.	x	x			x							x
New Bedford, Mass.	x			x	x						x	

TABLE 14--Continued

Cities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Too many administrative duties delegated by the superintendent	Lack of coordination of duties in supervision	Responsible for inventory and transfer of supplies	Abundance of clerical work	Special emergency duties such as reports on collections, tests, sales and drives	Personnel assignments and transfers	Confusion regarding relation to instruction	Responsible for finances, budget items	Frequent conferences with parents and patrons	Rigid plan of organization	Overlapping of duties of administration and supervision	Lack of definite policy on supervision by intermediaries
New York, N. Y.	x			x	x				x		x	
Norfolk, Va.	x				x			x			x	
Oakland, Calif.	x			x	x							x
Peoria, Ill.		x		x	x			x			x	x
Philadelphia, Pa.	x	x		x	x		x				x	x
Pittsburgh, Pa.					x	x						
Providence, R. I.	x				x	x					x	
Richmond, Va.	x				x						x	
Rochester, N. Y.			x		x	x					x	
Sacramento, Calif.	x		x		x	x	x				x	
St. Louis, Mo.	x			x	x	x					x	
St. Paul, Minn.	x		x		x		x				x	
San Antonio, Tex.	x				x							
San Diego, Calif.	x		x					x				x
San Francisco, Calif.	x				x	x		x			x	
Seattle, Wash.	x				x	x		x			x	

TABLE 14--Continued

Cities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Too many administrative duties delegated by the superintendent	Lack of coordination of duties in supervision	Responsible for inventory and transfer of supplies	Abundance of clerical work	Special emergency duties such as reports on collections, tests, sales and drives	Personnel assignments and transfers	Confusion regarding relation to instruction	Responsible for finances, budget items	Frequent conferences with parents and patrons	Rigid plan of organization	Overlapping of duties of administration and supervision	Lack of definite policy on supervision by intermediaries
Somerville, Mass.	x				x						x	
Springfield, Mass.	x		x		x			x			x	
Tacoma, Wash.	x				x	x		x			x	
Toledo, Ohio			x		x			x				
Tulsa, Okla.	x				x	x						
Utica, N. Y.	x		x								x	
Washington, D. C.	x				x	x		x			x	
Wichita, Kan.			x		x						x	x
Wilmington, Del.	x				x	x					x	x
Youngstown, Ohio	x		x		x			x				
Total	50	11	22	18	54	20	4	16	5	2	32	13

regarding supervisory functions of intermediary officers.

Clerical work is assigned to the intermediary officers in eighteen cities; and in twelve cities there is a paucity of coordination of duties, all of which handicap the intermediary

officers from educational leadership.

In sixteen cities the intermediary officers are responsible for the budget and finances.

Only in two cities is found a rigid organization structure which prevent initiative to operate in areas of instruction.

Summary

Analysis of the findings and recommendations of school surveys and studies of school administration in city school systems reveal that the powers and duties of intermediary officers have gradually increased in scope since establishment of their positions. In some city school systems duties of various intermediary officers tend to overlap and as a result there is evident lack of coordination and unity. The city school superintendents and boards of education have taken cognizance of these and other conditions in schools and have sought measures to correct these conditions. One of these measures has been to invite survey commissions from outside the school systems to study and report on the conditions in schools.

Twenty-two of the fifty-seven cities studied in this investigation have invited survey commissions to study their schools. The findings of these commissions reveal that intermediary officers have existed for a considerable period of time in most of the cities prior to the surveys and that several different names have been given to these officers. These officers are classified in four groups.

The first of these four groups is composed of Deputy, First Assistant, Chief Deputy, and First Associate Superintendents. Officials of this type are found in ten cities. The survey commissions state that these officers are needed to relieve the superintendent of the great burden of details in administration of city schools and for coordinating the duties of subordinate intermediary officers. The duties of this group of officers are almost exclusively administrative in nature and are exceedingly important in facilitating the program of instruction.

The second group of intermediary officers is composed of Associate, Assistant, and Associate Assistant Superintendents. This group comprises the largest number and is found in fifty-seven cities. The total number of these intermediaries is 186

with one or two of these titles in each city. Survey findings reveal that the duties of these officers deviated from the original supervisory activities to a combination of administrative and supervisory duties and to some extent into clerical functions. In some cities, this situation has prevented these officers from giving more time to instruction. Therefore, survey commissions recommended that these intermediary officers be assigned functional duties in specialized areas, such as personnel, administration, instruction and curriculum, and to the business affairs of the school system. Survey staffs point out that by assigning these officers to functional duties they will be in a better position to contribute to educational leadership. The present organization and manner of delegating duties does not enhance the professional position of these intermediaries.

The third group are the district superintendents who are found in the school systems of Chicago, Philadelphia and Detroit. Survey findings show that in the first two cities there is a manifest disposition to withhold administrative authority from these officers. They depend too much on the orders from the central office which they are required to transmit and they tend to act as field agents for the assistant superintendent under whom they work. Moreover, the findings show that these officers are not giving much time to instruction because they are burdened with too many administrative duties. In general, survey reports were critical of the entire set up of delegating duties to district superintendents. A break is recommended with the traditional practices of assigning duties to district superintendents without commensurate authority. Instead of being field agents for the central office, the district superintendents should be educational leaders in their communities and should provide new ideas and policies of distinctive professional merit.

The last group of intermediary officers is the supervisory principals found in Washington, D. C., and in Somerville, Massachusetts. There are sixteen such officers in both cities. In general, the survey commissions found these intermediary officers performing administrative and supervisory duties effectively. In Washington supervisory principals have given a good account of their services to instruction. They have been relieved of their particular schools and assigned to a division of the city or a group of schools to supervise.

Generally, the survey studies have revealed many weaknesses in the work of intermediary officers but have found also many strong points for each of the four groups. Survey commissions, however, approve the appointment of intermediary officers, but recommend a change of policy and emphasis regarding the functional assignments of these officers in city schools. It is of utmost importance to an efficient program of administration that consideration be given to duties of these officers in relation to the program of instruction.

It is clear that large city school systems cannot be administered without assistants who function between the superintendent and the school principals. The most effective utilization of these intermediary officers in city school systems is still one of the unsolved problems in educational administration. It is the judgment of the survey staffs and students of educational administration that the correct solution of the duties of intermediary officers requires that a greater emphasis be given to instruction than now exists in most school systems.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The superintendent of schools in American cities made his appearance in the latter part of the first half of the nineteenth century. Size of the school system was an important factor in the establishment of the superintendency, although other factors also contributed, such as the need for grading the schools, the need for better buildings, and the rapid increase in business duties in connection with the operation and maintenance of school plants and school finance.

Lay board members, generally unsalaried, found themselves unable to cope with the multitude of instructional and managerial duties resulting from the rapid growth of schools. They tried many expedients, such as school visitors, business agents, standing committees, and the like before discovering that the proper administration of the schools required an officer with educational qualifications as well as executive ability. Finally, in a few of the larger cities appointments were made of persons with school experience. The title that proved most popular for this type of official was superintendent of schools.

In the larger school systems the superintendent found usually a head teacher or principal teacher in charge of each local school. The superintendent quickly realized the importance of this individual in the supervision and administration of his schools. Superintendents generally in the larger cities sought to develop these head teachers as assistants. Release from teaching duties in order that more time could be spent in assisting the teachers, in supervising instruction, in managing pupils, and in dealing with parents was recognized as necessary to the successful management of the local schools, since the superintendent was unable to give the attention to the individual schools of the system which they required. In time the supervising school principal emerged as the representative of the superintendent in the individual school.

While the evolution just described was taking place city school systems were also developing in the rapidly growing cities of the United States. The duties of the superintendent soon became so onerous that he found additional assistance necessary in articulating the work of the individual schools and in carrying on the duties of the central administrative office. This need was first expressed by the superintendent in the form of complaints to his board regarding his inability to perform all the duties required of him in the official rules and regulations. Later proposals or recommendations were made to the board that an assistant be provided to function between himself and the principals of the local schools.

The records reveal that this need was general in the rapidly growing city school systems. Since there was no pattern to follow, the proposals for assistants differed in the different school systems. In some systems the new assistants were designated assistant superintendents, associate superintendents, deputy superintendents, district superintendents, and supervising principals. In a few of the larger cities secondary intermediary officers were appointed to function as assistants between the established intermediary officers and the principals of the schools. These were known as special subject supervisors.

The development of these intermediary officers was slow during the years 1854 to 1900. During that period only twelve cities of the fifty-seven cities studied made provisions for intermediary school administrators. From 1900 to 1920, eighteen cities found it necessary to appoint such officers; thirteen more cities made appointments between 1920 and 1930; and since that time, fourteen additional cities have found reasons to follow the same practice.

It is apparent from these data that most of the intermediary officers were appointed after 1900. Since that year, forty-five of the fifty-seven cities school systems studied have appointed 214 intermediary officers. The highest number of these assistants to be appointed in a single decade was sixty-eight between 1920 and 1930. The next highest number, fifty-one, was appointed between 1930 and 1940.

In October 1945 there were employed 253 intermediary officers in the fifty-seven cities considered in this investigation. Most of these were in the thirteen cities with a population of

500,000 to 1,000,000 or over. These thirteen cities had 149 intermediary officers; the seventeen cities with population of 250,000 to 500,000 had fifty-one; and the twenty-six cities with population of 100,000 to 250,000 had fifty-three. Among these officers were 163 assistant superintendents in fifty-three cities; twenty-five associate superintendents in six cities; six deputy superintendents in six cities; one first assistant superintendent in one city; one chief associate superintendent in one city; eight associate superintendents in two cities; thirty-one district superintendents in three cities; and sixteen supervising principals in two cities. Cities of 250,000 population to 1,000,000 and over, representing approximately fifty-five per cent of the number studied, have eighty per cent of the total number of intermediary officers. Cities from 100,000 to 250,000 in population, representing approximately forty-five per cent of the cities studied, have twenty per cent of the total number of these officers.

The duties assigned to the various intermediary officers also differed from system to system, especially after 1900. However, certain tendencies in the assignment of duties to such officials are very definitely revealed. The introduction of new subjects in the school curriculum required that the superintendent have assistance in supervising these subjects. Teachers of the new subjects had to be trained, curricula and methods of teaching for these new subjects had to be prepared and developed; and follow up measures had to be organized. Teachers' meetings, previously planned and conducted by the superintendent were now conducted largely by intermediary officers who were assigned to supervise these new subjects.

The development of graded schools demanded more effective supervision. This made it necessary for the city superintendent to delegate the supervisory duties of grading the schools to the intermediary officers. In this work many of the intermediary officers distinguished themselves. The delegation of supervisory duties to intermediary officers relieved the superintendent to the extent that he no longer had to visit at intervals prescribed by the board all the schools, evaluate instruction, and spend much time in curriculum revision. The intermediary officers made it possible for the superintendent to devote his time to the overall supervision and administration of the entire city school.

system. Thus, the early intermediary officers were assigned very largely to the supervision of instruction. They inevitably had to be, since conditions in the schools required that immediate attention be given to the improvement of instruction.

Subsequently, however, the superintendents found it necessary also to assign administrative duties to his assistants. For example, the recruitment and selection of teachers, selection of building sites, and numerous business duties incident to efficient school administration are some of the duties that intermediary officers were required to perform. These officers were assigned to visit schools and to report on general conditions, with no special emphasis on supervision, since special subject supervisors were appointed and were charged with helping the principals and teachers with problems of instruction. It should, however, be understood that intermediary officers were not relieved from supervisory duties. They merely had other duties added to their responsibilities.

To avoid misunderstandings in duties, the superintendents defined better the lines of authority which were incorporated in board rules and by-laws. In time these lines of authority became complicated and it was necessary to set up different patterns of duties for different kinds of intermediary officers. The deputy superintendents, for example, were delegated many special duties. In eight cities, they act in the superintendent's place during his absence. They are also made responsible for a division, elementary or secondary, and the supervisory of administrative and clerical problems incident to their divisions. In addition, they assume responsibility for semi-business duties, public relations program, and generally, assist the superintendent in the many details of administration of the entire school system.

In several cities, the first associate and the first assistant superintendents perform substantially the same duties as deputy superintendents. In two cities these officers are assigned to have charge of vocational and continuation schools. Cities in which the senior intermediary officers are designated as chief deputy superintendents perform substantially the same duties as deputy superintendents.

The assistant superintendents who comprise the largest group of all the intermediary officers are assigned many kinds of varied duties, mostly a combination of supervisory and

administrative activities. In nine cities one assistant is assigned to the business affairs of the school system. He has full charge of all expenditures, buildings, purchases, and all other financial transactions. He is responsible directly to the superintendent of schools, is the deputy of the superintendent in the business management of schools, and is required to submit to his superintendent periodical reports on all accounts.

In some cities assistant superintendents have charge of elementary or secondary school divisions with all administrative, supervisory, and clerical duties pertaining to their divisions. In several cities they have charge of public relations, personnel, budgets, buildings, surveys, curriculum studies, and inventories. Only in a few cities are assistant superintendents assigned exclusively to instruction, curriculum, and research. These are referred to as assistant superintendents of instruction.

The assistant superintendents are in most part line officers who have direct control of the district superintendents and supervising principals. They channel the superintendent's policies and instructions through the district superintendents and supervising principals to the building principals.

The district superintendents are assigned administrative and supervisory duties of a given number of elementary or secondary schools. They are expected to help the building principals with problems of instruction, personnel, curriculum, organization, and the interpretation of the superintendent's policies. In addition, they perform a host of administrative duties with reference to the transfer of pupils, reports on inefficient teachers, and the many requests which from time to time are made as emergency matters. It is difficult at times to determine whether district superintendents are administrative or supervisory officers. The difficulty in the present situation is that heavy demands are made on their time for matters not always pertinent to the improvement of instruction.

The supervising principals, in large measure, are assigned to duties which deal specifically with instruction. They themselves are part time principals and visit schools in their areas for the purpose of advising other principals in problems of instruction, teacher training programs, and curriculum interpretation. They are not, however, entirely free from administrative duties, since they engage to a limited extent in checking budget

requests, and building needs. Most of their time, however, is devoted to problems of instruction.

The duties of 253 intermediary officers in fifty-seven cities fall into three classifications, namely administrative and supervisory; strictly supervisory; and exclusively business affairs. This fact indicates that in their present duties, intermediary officers have deviated from the original purposes of their establishment probably because of changing conditions in rapidly growing city school systems.

The duties of intermediary officers have been the subject of consideration in numerous surveys and studies of city school systems. The findings of these studies reveal definite weaknesses with respect to the assignment and performance of duties. The general opinion is that intermediary officers devote too little of their time to the improvement of instruction. The main reasons for this state of affairs lie in the fact that rigid organization patterns in city school systems prevent these officers from asserting their educational leadership in the field of instruction. This is especially evident that, in this particular instance, the intermediary officers tend to become too much involved in the details of administration and as a result find little time for instructional duties.

Equally important in the survey findings is the fact that lack of coordination of duties and the functional division of responsibilities of intermediary officers lead to confusion and overlapping in duties. The central offices in some city schools have failed to coordinate and to stimulate the personnel to the main function of the schools--instruction.

Moreover, the wide distribution of functions among intermediary officers in a scope that is city wide contributes to difficulties with the school principals. The principals frequently cannot locate the particular intermediary officer who is responsible at the time for the activity about which the principal is concerned. It is apparent that the lines of relationship from the intermediary officer to the principal are not clearly defined in many cities. These not too clear relationships cause delay in administration and frequently restrict the usefulness of intermediary officers.

The large number of special assignments delegated to intermediary officers has also been a subject of special study by

survey commissions in several cities. The general opinion expressed with respect to this matter is that such delegation of duties causes delays in scheduling school visits, and seriously encroaches on the time of these officers who could more profitably spend this time on problems of instruction. The survey staffs in their studies of several school systems have been particularly critical in their appraisal of assignment of special duties to high salaried associate, first assistants, and deputy superintendents.

The functions of district superintendents have been studied in the three cities where these intermediary officers are found. In general, the survey findings point to the fact that in three of the four cities the district superintendents carry too heavy a load in a number of schools with respect to administrative details and special duties. They spend too much time on matters which could be channelled elsewhere. They also devote too much time and effort to extraneous demands from too many persons from the central office. These unnecessary demands on time and the large number of schools assigned simply overshadow the educational leadership of district superintendents in three of the four cities.

Survey authorities were cognizant of the paucity of inservice education for intermediary officers in city school systems. Creative leadership cannot be realized from mere performance of duties in routine fashion based on trial and error methods, and educational leadership will not be in evidence unless opportunity is presented for growth in service through a program of inservice training for these officers. The long years of experience may prove to be only one year repeated so many times. Extended experience is not sufficient preparation for progressive leadership; continuous training and study are necessary.

In light of these findings, the survey commissions have proposed improvements. They have recommended that all duties ought to be assigned in accordance with the principle that the training of children is to be the central purpose in the control of everything involved. The training of children is the ultimate end to which all means in a school system must be adapted. Successful achievement of ends will depend in a large measure on the effectiveness of organization, control, and direction of the means.

In the findings of survey studies, the intermediary officers in too many cities perform their duties in the ways that they have learned largely by routine and trial without knowing exactly what products they are expected to turn out, or whether their labors have been effective in influencing instruction. They are too perfunctory in the performance of duties, and in the final analysis, their importance as professional leaders is overshadowed as a result of their routine and traditional practices.

In order to improve this situation survey commissions have recommended that the whole field of organization with respect to the duties of intermediary officers be studied. This study should consider the reorganization of line and staff relationship and should ultimately lead to such reassignment and reconstruction of duties as may be necessary to secure the improvement of instructional services by the intermediary officers.

Moreover, the survey staffs have proposed over and over again throughout their reports that whenever administrative function is mentioned it must be thought of as a service to the children, teachers, parents, and community at large. The efficiency of an administrative officer in a school system will depend upon his professional scholarship, insight, and imagination. In view of these needs, survey studies recommend that a greater number of intermediary officers be involved in problems of instruction. In particular, they suggest that more associate and assistant superintendents be assigned to curriculum studies and educational research. From these experiences, the intermediary officers can better judge the effectiveness of their services to instruction and can better realize personal growth in service.

The creation of the office of deputy or associate superintendent is essential in a large city system. Survey staffs have strongly recommended this type of an intermediary officer to relieve the superintendent of the details that are associated with his office.

Almost unanimously survey staffs recommend that an assistant superintendent be assigned to duties pertaining to business affairs. This assistant should be the superintendent's deputy in the business affairs of the school system and should be directly responsible to the superintendent and not to the board of education.

Further survey recommendations point out that intermediary

officers now in charge of elementary or secondary divisions should be placed in a position which will enable them to devote their entire time to the instructional program and which will require complete cooperation with each other. The very fact of working in this relationship will tend to break down the unwarranted lack of coordination between elementary and secondary education.

Some survey staffs propose and recommend very strongly the appointment of an assistant superintendent in charge of instruction and curriculum and an assistant superintendent in charge of administration. This should clear the way for the assistant superintendent for instruction to devote all his time to instructional problems. The assistant superintendent of administration would have administrative supervision over administrative problems. This differentiation of responsibilities should make for more prompt and effective service in the area of instruction and administration and should result in better coordination of efforts.

With regard to the district superintendents, survey commissions advocate that these officers be relieved of the many administrative functions and that they be given the authority and opportunity to exercise professional leadership. They should be educational leaders, capable of organizing and maintaining through cooperative work with principals and teachers an effective program of education more suitable to the needs of their districts than city wide programs can possibly be. Elevating this office to a high degree of professional importance is greatly needed in the cities which have district superintendents as intermediary officers. Their usefulness lies in the assignment of duties in a functional manner. Their services, according to survey opinions, may extend to many fields, but their main efforts should be directed to the improvement of instruction.

Analysis of survey reports, recommendations, and answers from questionnaires from fifty-seven cities warrant the generalization with few exceptions that many intermediary officers are not making their services felt sufficiently in the area of instruction. In general, these officers devote less than half of their time to instructional problems. They perform many tasks usefully and efficiently, but are seriously handicapped with a load of duties not germane to instruction.

Some city school systems have been studied by survey commissions two or three times in a period of twenty years. Even these cities still face the problem of how to meet the standards recommended by the survey commissions. In the judgment of the survey staffs, efficiency of administration in city school systems can be greatly increased through the improvement of the standards for the selection of intermediary officers. Best services cannot be expected when methods of selection have remained long unchanged. Standards which require the evaluation of the candidate's past record, professional preparation, professional contributions, and productivity in education as well as personal qualifications should be adopted and fairly applied in the selection of personnel for positions as intermediary officers.

The survey reports also point out efficient patterns for organizing the work of intermediary officers in several cities. These patterns should be utilized as guides in planning the duties and responsibilities of intermediary officers in particular school systems.

An important factor in the worth of intermediary officers to their school systems is that of tenure in office. At present, tenure varies from city to city. Some have fixed tenure for a given number of years, usually from three to six; others serve at the pleasure of the superintendent. In one city only does their selection depend on rigid examination and their tenure on periodic evaluation of efficiency in office.

On the premise that these officers are making an important contribution to the program of instruction, fifty-three cities spent a total of \$1,678,417, or approximately \$7,000 every year, for the services of each intermediary officer in 1945. This premise is further based on the fact that intermediary officers are well prepared professionally. Over the years these officers have engaged in professional study with the net result that in 1945 of 206 for whom data were available only two were without degrees; thirty-four had acquired bachelors' degrees only; 129, the master's degree; thirty-seven, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; and four, the degree of Doctor of Education.

The general importance of intermediary officers in city school systems and the status of their salaries and professional training appear somewhat inconsistent when these officers are considered in light of the high expectations of those responsible

for the establishment of the positions and the shortcomings in accomplishments found by the survey commissions which have evaluated city school systems employing intermediary officers. If the inconsistency is to be resolved it must be done by the intermediary officers themselves. They must measure up to the possibilities of their positions by identifying their opportunities for unique services in the areas in which they function between the central office and local school units. These unique services must not be by-passed for other activities of greater interest to the intermediary officers but of lesser value to the school systems which they serve.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annual Reports of Boards of Education

- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Atlanta, Georgia. Atlanta: Board of Education, 1891; 1941-1942.
- Annual Reports of the Board of School Commissioners to the Mayor and the City Council of Baltimore, Maryland. Baltimore: School Commissioners, 1891; 1899; 1906; 1912; 1937; 1940.
- Annual Reports of the School Committee of the City of Boston, Massachusetts. Boston: School Committee, 1876; 1877; 1878; 1866, 1879; 1882; 1883.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Buffalo, New York. Buffalo: Board of Education, 1936; 1937; 1945.
- Annual Reports of the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina. Charlotte: Board of School Commissioners, 1928-1929.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, Illinois. Chicago: Board of Education, 1860; 1869; 1871; 1881; 1885; 1888; 1898; 1905; 1925; 1926; 1929; 1933; 1936; 1939; 1940; 1942.
- Annual Reports of the Public Schools of the City of Cincinnati, Ohio. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1888; 1889; 1902.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Cleveland, Ohio. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1872; 1873; 1895; 1896; 1900; 1903; 1935.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Columbus, Ohio. Columbus: Board of Education, 1889; 1915; 1935; 1936.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Dayton, Ohio. Dayton: Board of Education, 1932; 1937; 1939.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Denver, Colorado. Denver: Board of Education, 1903-1904; 1904-1905; 1922-1923; 1926-1927.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Des Moines, Iowa. Des Moines: Board of Education, 1918; 1940; 1941.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, Michigan. Detroit: Board of Education, 1863; 1884; 1920; 1921; 1930.

- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Duluth, Minnesota. Duluth: Board of Education, 1905; 1906; 1915; 1921; 1923.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Erie, Pennsylvania. Erie: Board of Education, 1929.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Flint, Michigan. Flint: Board of Education, 1900-1901.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Fort Worth, Texas. Fort Worth: Board of Education, 1916; 1924.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Gary, Indiana. Gary: Board of Education, 1942.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Grand Rapids, Michigan. Grand Rapids: Board of Education, 1914.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Houston, Texas. Houston: Board of Education, 1905-1906; 1939-1940.
- Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana. Indianapolis: Board of School Commissioners, 1942.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Jacksonville, Florida. Jacksonville: Board of Education, 1940.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Kansas City, Missouri. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1892; 1893; 1898; 1900.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Long Beach, California. Long Beach: Board of Education, 1940.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles, California. Los Angeles: Board of Education, 1899; 1908; 1909; 1910.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Louisville, Kentucky. Louisville: Board of Education, 1907; 1908; 1909; 1910.
- Annual Reports of the Board of School Directors of the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Milwaukee: Board of School Directors, 1918; 1937.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota. Minneapolis: Board of Education, 1891; 1892; 1911; 1912.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Newark, New Jersey. Newark: Board of Education, 1903; 1905.
- Annual Reports of the School Committee of the City of New Bedford, Connecticut. New Bedford: School Committee, 1905; 1906; 1907; 1940.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of New Haven, Connecticut. New Haven: Board of Education, 1911; 1913; 1915.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of New York, New York. New York: Board of Education, 1854; 1857; 1891; 1899; 1902; 1906; 1935; 1936; 1942-1943; 1943-1944.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Norfolk, Virginia. Norfolk: Board of Education, 1920; 1921.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Oakland, California. Oakland: Board of Education, 1930; 1932; 1933; 1934; 1936; 1940.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Peoria, Illinois. Peoria: Board of Education, 1941; 1942.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1883; 1884; 1886.

Annual Reports of the Board of Public Education of the School District of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh: Board of Public Education, 1909-1910; 1912; 1913; 1930.

Annual Reports of the School Committee of the City of Providence, Rhode Island. Providence: School Committee, 1888; 1902; 1924.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Richmond, Virginia. Richmond: Board of Education, 1905; 1907.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Rochester, New York. Rochester: Board of Education, 1903-1904; 1908-1909; 1909-1910; 1911-12-13.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Sacramento, California. Sacramento: Board of Education, 1923; 1924.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, Missouri. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1866; 1867; 1868; 1870; 1871; 1872; 1891; 1897; 1903; 1904; 1921; 1922; 1923; 1927; 1929; 1930; 1931; 1932; 1934; 1935; 1942; 1944.

Annual Report of the Board of School Inspectors of the City of St. Paul, Minnesota. St. Paul: Board of School Inspectors, 1900.

Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of San Antonio, Texas. San Antonio: Board of Education, 1919; 1920; 1921.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of San Diego, California. San Diego: Board of Education, 1919; 1925; 1939; 1943.

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City and County of San Francisco, California. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1867; 1874; 1892; 1941; 1944.

- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Seattle, Washington. Seattle: Board of Education, 1898; 1899; 1901; 1903; 1904.
- Annual Report of the School Committee of Somerville, Massachusetts. Somerville: School Committee, 1943.
- Annual Reports of the School Committee of the City of Springfield, Massachusetts. Springfield: School Committee, 1940; 1941; 1942; 1943.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Tacoma, Washington. Tacoma: Board of Education, 1911; 1912.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Toledo, Ohio. Toledo: Board of Education, 1920; 1921.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma. Tulsa: Board of Education, 1923; 1924; 1927; 1929; 1934; 1944.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of Utica, New York. Utica: Board of Education, 1920; 1922; 1923.
- Annual Reports of the Trustees of Public Schools of the City of Washington, District of Columbia and the District. Washington: Board of Trustees, 1874-1875; 1920-1921; 1929-1930; 1937; 1940; 1941; 1943.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Wichita, Kansas. Wichita: Board of Education, 1943; 1944.
- Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Wilmington, Delaware. Wilmington: Board of Education, 1937.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Youngstown, Ohio. Youngstown: Board of Education, 1930; 1932; 1944.
- Superintendents' Reports Issued in Separate Form
From the Board of Education Annual Reports
- Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Baltimore, Maryland. Baltimore: Board of Education, 1906.
- Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Buffalo, New York. Buffalo: Board of Education, 1936.
- Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Chicago, Illinois. Chicago: Board of Education, 1860; 1928; 1933; 1936; 1940-1941; 1942.
- Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Cleveland, Ohio. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1872; 1873.
- Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Denver, Colorado. Denver: Board of Education, 1922-1923; 1923-1924.

Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Detroit, Michigan. Detroit: Board of Education, 1920; 1921.

Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Los Angeles, California. Los Angeles: Board of Education, 1899-1900; 1900-1901.

Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota. Minneapolis: Board of Education, 1892.

Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of New Haven, Connecticut. New Haven: Board of Education, 1913; 1914.

Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of New York, New York. New York: Board of Education, 1857; 1898; 1899; 1900; 1906; 1935; 1942; 1943; 1944; 1945.

Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1883.

Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of St. Louis, Missouri. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1890; 1902-1903.

Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of San Francisco, California. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1867.

Surveys

Report of the Survey of the Public School System of Atlanta, Georgia. Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York City, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1921-1922, pp. iii + 251.

Report of the Survey of the Public School System of Baltimore, Maryland. Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York City, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1921, pp. iii + 360.

Survey Report of Battle Creek Public Schools, Battle Creek, Michigan. Committee on Field Services, Department of Education, University of Chicago. Battle Creek, Michigan: The Board of Education, 1945, pp. viii + 453.

Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Boston, Massachusetts. Director George D. Strayer. Boston: City of Boston Printing Department, 1944, pp. xxxi + 1127.

Report of Certain Phases of Boston School System by the Committee of the Boston Public Schools. Published by the City of Boston, Massachusetts, School Document No. 12, 1930, pp. v + 297.

- Report of a Study of Certain Phases of the Public School System of Boston, Massachusetts. Made under the auspices of the Boston Finance Commission, James Hexon Van Sickle, Director published by the City of Boston, Document 87, 1916, pp. i + 219.
- Report of the Buffalo School Survey. The Survey of the Department of Education by Buffalo Municipal Research Bureau, December 1930, Part I, pp. v + 270; Part II, pp. vii + 180.
- Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago, Illinois. Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York City, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932, Vol. I, pp. xi + 350; Vol. II, pp. ix + 323; Vol. III, pp. ix + 227; Vol. IV, pp. xi + 315; Vol. V, pp. x + 357.
- Survey Report of the Cincinnati Public Schools. Made by the United States Office of Education, published by the Cincinnati Bureau of Governmental Research, Cincinnati, Ohio, Report No. 64, July, 1935, pp. vi + 475.
- Cleveland Educational Survey. School Organization and Administration, Directed by Leonard P. Ayres, Survey Committee, Cleveland Foundation, 1916, pp. v + 134.
- Report of the School Survey of District Number One in the City and County of Denver. Director Franklin Bobbitt, published by the Board of Education of Denver, Colorado, Part I, 1916, pp. i + 116.
- School Program for Escambia County. Florida State Department of Education. Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, 1941, pp. x + 258.
- The Gary Public Schools, Organization and Administration. A study of Gary Schools by George D. Strayer and Frank P. Bachman, published by General Educational Board, New York, 1918, pp. vii + 127.
- Forward to the Fundamentals in Education: The Hartford Schools in 1936-37. Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University New York City, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937, pp. xvi + 318.
- Survey of Hinsdale Schools. Committee on Field Services, Department of Education, University of Chicago. Hinsdale, Illinois: Board of Education, Districts 55 and 86, 1941, pp. i + 116.
- Report on a Study of the School System of Kansas City, Missouri. Charles Everand Reeves, Director of Studies in Education, prepared by Greffenhagen and Associates, Vol. I, January 10, 1940, pp. i + 187.
- Survey of the Los Angeles City Schools. Directed by Osman R. Hull and Willard S. Ford, University of Southern California. Published by Los Angeles City School District, 1934, pp. i + 384.

Survey Report of the Louisville Public Schools. Director George A. Works. Louisville, Kentucky: Printed by the City of Louisville, 1943, pp. xix + 466.

The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Newark, New Jersey. Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York City, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1942, pp. xviii + 581.

Principals' Policies and Plans for the Improvement of New Bedford Public Schools. Directed by Frank Spaulding, published by School Committee of New Bedford, 1922, pp. 1 + 181.

Report Survey of Public Schools System of the City of New York. Board of Education Survey Committee, published by the Board of Education, 1924, pp. iii + 1834.

Report of the New York City Sub-Committee of the Joint Legislative Committee on the State Education System. Transmitted to the Legislature March 17, 1944. Printed by Williams Press, Inc., Legislative Document No. 60, 1944, pp. 1 + 711.

Survey of the Pasadena City Schools. California Taxpayers Association, Incorporated, Association Report No. 119. Los Angeles: California Taxpayers Association Incorporated, 1931, pp. 1 + 331.

Philadelphia Public School Survey. Summary of Findings and Recommendations, Director, George A. Works. Published by the Board of Public Education of the School District of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1937, pp. 1 + 69.

The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York City, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940, pp. xviii + 564.

Sacramento School Survey. Directed by Jesse B. Sears, Board of Education, Sacramento, California, October, 1928, Vol. I, pp. 1 + 241; Vol. II, pp. ii + 572.

A Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of St. Louis, Missouri. Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York City, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938, pp. xxiv + 468.

Survey of the St. Louis Public Schools. Charles H. Judd, Director. Authorized by the Board of Education, May 11, 1916, (Official Proceedings, Vol. XXII, p. 976), Published by the Board of Education of St. Louis, Missouri, as per instructions, authorized April 10, 1917, (Official Proceedings Vol. XXIII, p. 87), issued December, 1917, Part II, Administrative Organization, pp. 1 + 92.

Survey of St. Louis Schools. Committee of Eighty. Approved recommendations Department of Instruction, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, St. Louis Public Schools, September, 1941, pp. 1 + 149.

Report of a Survey of the School System of St. Paul, Minnesota.
George D. Strayer, Director, Published by the Board of
Education of St. Paul, Minnesota, 1917, pp. 1 + 962.

Survey of the St. Paul Public Schools. St. Paul Department of
Education, under the direction of N. C. Kearney, published
by the St. Paul Board of Education, 1938, Vol. I, pp. 1
+ 320.

Stockton School Survey. Directed by Jesse B. Sears, Board of
Education, Stockton, California, September 10, 1938, pp.
iv + 586.

Manuscripts

Minutes of the Board of Education of Chicago, Illinois. May 11,
1945; July 23, 1926; January 30, 1933; July 12, 1930; July
22, 1936; July 14, 1939.

Minutes of the Board of Education of Detroit, Michigan. July 24,
1919; April 22, 1920.

Minutes of the School Committee of Providence, Rhode Island.
January 31, 1920.

Minutes of the Board of Education of St. Louis, Missouri.
September 12, 1914; September 14, 1915; September 10, 1940;
September 8, 1942; October 13, 1942; July 13, 1943.

Minutes of the Board of Education of San Francisco City and County.
August 28, 1944.

Minutes of the Trustees of Public Schools of the City of Washington,
District of Columbia. April 7, 1929.

Rules and By-Laws of Boards of Education

Handbook of By-Laws and Regulations of the Board of Education of
Atlanta, Georgia. Atlanta: Board of Education, 1939.

Rules of the School Committee and Regulations of the Public Schools
of the City of Boston. Document No. 7. Boston: School
Committee, 1935.

By-Laws and Regulations of the Board of Education of Buffalo, New
York. Buffalo: Board of Education, 1936.

By-Laws and Rules of the Board of School Commissioners of Charlotte,
North Carolina. Charlotte: Board of School Commissioners,
1928-29.

Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of Chicago,
Illinois. Chicago: Board of Education, Revised May 12,
1946.

Rules and Regulations of the Cincinnati, Ohio, Board of Education.
 (Adopted July 12) Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1944.

Administrative Code of the Board of Education of the City of Cleveland, Ohio, School District. Cleveland: Board of Education, adopted July 1, 1934.

Rules and Regulations of Dayton, Ohio, City Schools. Dayton: Board of Education, 1922.

By-Laws of the Independent School District (Adopted February 19)
by the Board of Education of the City of Des Moines, Iowa.
 Des Moines: Board of Education, 1924.

Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of Duluth, Minnesota. Adopted July 28, 1936. Duluth: Board of Education, 1936.

Extracts from the Pennsylvania School Code, Rules, Regulations and Resolutions. Adopted by the Board of School Directors of Erie, Pennsylvania. Erie: Board of School Directors, 1929.

Rules of the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana. Indianapolis: Board of Education, adopted June 30, 1942.

Rules and Regulations of the School District of Kansas City, Missouri. Kansas City: Board of Education, adopted March 25, 1936.

Administrative Code and the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of Long Beach, California. Long Beach: Board of Education, 1939.

Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles, California. Los Angeles: Board of Education, 1927.

Laws and Legislation of Public Schools of Louisville, Kentucky.
 Louisville: Board of Education, June, 1939.

Rules and Regulations of the Board of Directors of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Milwaukee: Board of School Directors, adopted June 30, 1924.

Charter Rules and Regulations of Minneapolis, Minnesota, Public Schools. Minneapolis: Board of Education, 1933.

Rules and Regulations and Salary Schedules of the New Bedford, Massachusetts, Public Schools. New Bedford: School Committee, Revised 1938.

Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of New York, New York. New York: Board of Education, June, 1935, Revised 1945.

Rules and Regulations of the Norfolk, Virginia, Public Schools.
 Norfolk: Board of Education, August, 1934.

- Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of Oakland, California. Oakland: Board of Education, 1936.
- Manual and Handbook for Principals in City Schools of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh: Board of Education, 1940.
- By-Laws and Regulations of the School Committee of Providence, Rhode Island. Providence: School Committee, 1929, Revised in 1938.
- Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of Richmond, Virginia. Richmond: Board of Education, March 23, 1939.
- Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of Rochester, New York. Rochester: Board of Education, April 9, 1926.
- Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of Sacramento Public Schools. Sacramento: Board of Education, March 3, 1941.
- Rules and Regulations of the Department of Instruction of the City of St. Louis. St. Louis: Board of Education, adopted February 1, 1934, Revised September 10, 1940; July 13, 1943.
- Administrative Code of the San Diego, California, Schools. (Revised August 7) San Diego: Board of Education, 1939.
- Rules of the Board of Education and Regulations of the Public Schools of San Francisco, California. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1874; 1914; 1930; 1938; 1940; Revised June, 1944.
- Rules and By-Laws of the School Committee of Somerville, Massachusetts. Somerville: School Committee, December 21, 1921.
- Rules and Regulations of the School Committee of Springfield, Massachusetts. Springfield: Board of Education, adopted December 2, 1941.
- Rules and Regulations of Washington, D. C., City Schools. Washington, D. C.: Board of Education, approved April 7 1943.
- Rules and Administrative Code of Wichita, Kansas, Public Schools. Wichita: Board of Education, Revised 1938.
- Rules of the Board of Public Education of Wilmington, Delaware. Wilmington: Board of Public Education, 1937.

Books

- Almack, John C. Modern School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1933, pp. x + 382.
- Barr, A.; Burton, William H.; Brueckner, Leo J. Supervision. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938, pp. v + 981.

- Deffenbaugh, W. C. Practices and Concepts Relating to City School Boards of Education. Biennial Survey of Education in the United States. Washington, D. C.: United States Office of Education, 1938-1940, pp. 111 + 27.
- Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction. Leadership at Work. The 15th Yearbook, N. E. A. Washington: National Education Association, 1943, pp. 111 + 248.
- Engelhardt, N. L., and Engelhardt, F. Public School Business Administration. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1927, pp. ix + 1068.
- Gilland, Thomas McDowell. The Origin and Development of the Power and the Duties of the City Superintendent. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935, pp. xiv + 279.
- Graves, Frank P. The Administration of American Education. New York: Macmillan Co., 1932, pp. xviii + 631.
- Koos, Leonard V.; Hughes, James M.; Hutson, Percival W.; and Reavis, William C. Administering the Secondary School. New York: American Book Co., 1941, pp. v + 678.
- Moehlman, Arthur B. School Administration. Chicago: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1940, pp. v + 929.
- Morrison, John Cayce. The Legal Status of the City School Superintendent. Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1922, pp. i + 162.
- Mort, P. R., and Reuser, W. C. Public School Finance. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1941, pp. vii + 569.
- Pierce, Paul R. The Origin and Development of Public School Principalship. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935, pp. ix + 223.
- Reavis, William C. Democratic Practices in School Administration. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Conference for Administrative Officers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. v + 214.
- Reavis, William C., and Jacobsen, Paul B. Duties of School Principals. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1941, pp. vii + 812.
- Reeder, Ward G. Fundamentals of Public School Administration. Chicago: Macmillan Co., 1941, pp. xii + 579.
- Reeder, Ward G. The Business Administration of a School System. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1929, pp. x + 454.
- Sears, J. B. City School Administrative Controls. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1938, pp. vii + 281.
- Smith, H. P. The Business Administration of a City School System. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925, pp. xv + 432.

Whitelaw, John B. Criteria for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Supervision. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940, pp. v + 34.

Other Materials

Administrative Management in the Government of the United States. Washington: Government Printing Office, January, 1937.

Directory of Detroit, Michigan, School Systems. Detroit: Board of Education, 1936-37.

Extracts from Statutes and Ordinances of the City of Baltimore. Relating to the Public Schools of Baltimore. Baltimore: Board of Public School Commissioners, 1890.

Hill, Clyde M., and Others. Administrative Organization Study of San Francisco Unified School District. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1944, pp. 1 + 58.

Journal of Proceedings of American Institute of Instruction. Portsmouth: American Institute of Instruction.

Pertsch, Frederick and Others. Report of Committee of the Association of Assistant Superintendents. New York: Board of Education, 1936.

Reavis, William C. Relations of School Principals to the Central Administrative Office in Large Cities. Published by the Department of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association, Vol. XXI, No. 66. Washington: National Education Association, 1937, pp. 1 + 368.

Records of School Committee of Providence, Rhode Island. Providence: School Committee Publication, January 31, 1902.

Report of the Committee of the Association of Assistant Superintendents of the City of New York, New York. New York: Board of Education, 1942.

Special Bulletin on Salary Schedules of the National Association of Education. Tabulations 1-B. Washington: National Education Association, 1945, pp. 1 + 34.

The School Laws of Pennsylvania. Harrisburg: Department of Public Instruction, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1933.

